DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 794 EC 071 558

AUTHOR	Keogh, Barbara K.; And Others
TITLE	A Review of Transition Programs in California Public Schools. Technical Report SERP 1974-A2.
INSTITUTION	California State Univ., Los Angeles.; California Univ., Los Angeles. Graduate School of Education
SPONS AGENCY	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
REPORT NO	SERP-1974-A2
PUB DATE	Nov 74
NOTE	95p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *Educable Mentally Handicapped; Equal Education; Exceptional Child Research; Financial Support; Inservice Teacher Education; Interviews; Mentally Handicapped; Minority Groups; Program Effectiveness; *Regular Class Placement; *State Surveys; *Student Placement
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

Administrators of 166 California school districts were questioned regarding transition programs (mandated by legislative and court actions) for students previously classified as educable mentally retarded (EMR). Detailed program descriptions were obtained from the 10 administrators interviewed, while information from 156 districts was obtained through a mailed questionnaire. Sample districts included high Anglo, high black, and high Spanish surname districts as well as districts ranging from small to large and representing all parts of the state including both rural and urban schools. Findings indicated that all districts had implemented systematic procedures to review EMR pupils though specifics varied widely, and that ethnic characteristics of reclassified pupils reflected the ethnic characteristics of the district. The most popular transition model was regular class placement with tutorial help from paraprofessional aides. Inservice training for staff serving transition pupils was conducted by approximately half the districts. Most programs were supported by state funds with some districts matching with local funds. Administrators agreed that previous inequities of placement were being corrected, though there was less confidence that transition programing was consistently beneficial to transition or regular class pupils. Recommendations included the development of comprehensive systems for program evaluation. Appended are texts of relevant legislation and Department of Education directives, the interview schedule and questionnaire, and a listing of participating districts. (DB)

ED102714

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EC

A REVIEW OF TRANSITION PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Barbara K. Keogh
Marc L. Levitt
George Robson
Kenyon S. Chan

Technical Report SERP 1974-A2

Prepared Under Contract No. 5386 Between the California State Department of Education and the University of California, Los Angeles

Graduate School of Education
University of California
Los Angeles

November, 1974

EC071588

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	iii
Foreward	iv
Purpose and Plan	1
Background	1
Procedures	16
Phase I.	16
Phase II	18
Results.	23
Interview Findings	23
Questionnaire Results.	34
Summary and Recommendations.	48
References	54
Appendixes	57

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Number of Pupils Enrolled in EMR Programs, 1960 - 1974	10
2	Districts According to ADA Number and Percent of Sample	20
3	Number and Percent of Sample Districts in Various Grade Level Groupings.	21
4	Number and Percent of Districts in Each Category of Ethnic Representation	22
5	Number and Percent of Districts Utilizing Transition and Placement Program Options.	38
6	Number and Percent of Districts Providing Inservice Training for Particular Target Groups.	40
7	District Administrators' Views of Support Services for Transition Programs as Provided by the State Department of Education.	42
8	District Administrators' Views of Effects of Transition Placement as Compared to Effects of Self-Contained EMR Placement.	44
9	District Administrators' Responses to Field Generated Statements about Transition Programs	46

Foreword

The study reported here was part of a program of research in Special Education now in progress in the Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, and the Department of Special Education, California State University, Los Angeles. Studies were carried out during the academic year 1973-74 under the auspices of the Special Education Research Program, supported by Contract No. 5386 between the California State Department of Education and the University of California, Los Angeles.

The full report is reproduced in this form for distribution as a technical report under the contract, and in order to make complete findings available for others engaged in this research area. Results of this study are the sole responsibility of the investigators. Official endorsement of the California State Department of Education or the University of California, Los Angeles, Special Education Research Program is not implied.

The authors wish to thank the many administrators and program directors who were interviewed or who completed the questionaires used in the study. Their willingness to share time and expertise made the project possible. We also thank members of the State Department of Education for continuing consultation and help, and Ms. Karen Tardo for her critical review of the manuscript.

A complete list of projects funded through the Special Education Research Program may be found in Appendix G.

Barbara K. Keogh, Ph.D.
Director, Special Education
Research Program

November, 1974

Purpose and Plan

This project was conducted in response to a request from the California State Department of Education to review compensatory or supplemental programs implemented under Section 18102.11 of the California Education Code, often referred to as "Transition Programs." UCLA project staff have worked in cooperation with researchers from UC Riverside and USC who are involved in a Federally funded study of pupils reclassified from Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR) status. The UCLA project, focused on administrative and programmatic aspects of implementation of supplemental or "transition" legislation, consisted of two phases. Phase 1 involved on-site interviews with district administrators in charge of 18102.11 programs in ten selected school districts. Phase 2 involved questionaires, contents developed in part from information collected in Phase 1, sent by mail to all districts having approved supplemental or transition programs. Findings from the two phases were combined to allow consideration of procedures for planning and implementation, identification and placement of pupils, curricular and instructional accommodations, preparation of personnel, and followup and evaluation.

Background

The educational program under consideration in this project must be viewed within the context of the social, political, and legal pressures for change in educational practices which have characterized the past decade (Coleman, 1968; Cohen & DeYoung, 1973; Kirp, 1973; Kirp, Buss, & Kuriloff, 1974; Mercer, 1970). While it is likely that possible inadequacies and inequities of traditional self-contained and segregated special education programs were known to educators for many years, it

was legal decision that brought about rapid and sometimes precipitous change in special educational practices (Weintraub, 1971). Despite the unique aspect of each of the many cases considered by courts across the country, there have been a number of common issues and complaints. In a recent review of litigation concerning special education issues Ross, Cohen, and DeYoung (1971) identified five basic arguments. These had to do with inappropriate selection of tests; incompetence in administration of tests; lack of parental involvement in screening and placement decisions; inadequacy of special education programming; and stigmatizing effects of labeling. These authors note that the net effect of traditional selection and placement practices was to work against pupils from ethnic minority and disadvantaged economic backgrounds.

Although the legal battle has been fought in courts across the country, several key cases have been considered in Californa. The case of Diana v. Board of Education (1970) especially had far reaching effects on special education practices in the State. In essence, the Diana case affirmed that pupils of all ethnic and social backgrounds have equal educational opportunities, that pupils cannot be placed in programs for EMR when they can be served in regular school programs, and that identification and screening procedures be revised to be equitable for all pupils. Policies for monitoring special programs for ethnic representation, and re-evaluation of pupils in special programs were also specified. The substance and direction of the Diana decision was also involved in the case of Covarrubias v. San Diego Unified School District (1971) and in court action in other states (Guadalupe v. Tempe Elementary School District, 1971; Stewart v. Phillips, 1970). The reader is referred to the comprehensive reports by Kirp (1973) and Kirp, et al (1974) for detailed review.

Influences for Change

In addition to court action affecting special education practices, the State Department of Education, parent, professional, and other special interest groups were active in bringing about changes in programs, especially where ethnic minorities were concerned. Under leadership of the State Department of Education, the Committee on Minority Group Children was established in 1968 to plan and conduct an inservice workshop on minority children. Held in Sacramento in June, 1968, the workshop was attended by representatives from the Divisions of Instruction, Compensatory Education, and Special Education of the State Department of Education, along with representatives of various appropriate professional and special interest groups. Participants formulated a number of specific recommendations for change which would have direct affect on minority children in special education programs. Recommendations included improved procedures for identification and placement of pupils, and inservice training for school psychologists (Workshop on Minority Group Children in Special Education, 1968).

In the Fall of 1969 the State Department of Education and the California Association of School Psychologists and Psychometrists (CASPP) cosponsored a series of Hearings held in San Diego, Los Angeles, and San Jose. The purpose of these meetings was to consider problems of minority children in Special education programs, and specifically, to consider implementation of House Resolution 444 authored by Assemblyman Deddah in 1969 (Appendix A). HR 444 involved cooperative action of CASSP, the State Department of Education, and a number of organizations representing Mexican-American and minority pupils, including the California Rural League Defense Association. Following HR 444 an extensive report including recommendations for changes was prepared by the Division of Special Education

and the Legislature (1970).

Prior to legislatively mandated changes in EMR program operation, thus, there was evidence of change in EMR programs. State Department of Education personnel prepared and disseminated information about need for improved practices, and provided districts with consultation about need for improved practices, and provided districts with consultation about EMR programming. Many districts modified procedures and programs as problems of minority pupils were recognized. In 1969 the State Department of Education issued a report by Chandler and Plakos recommending transition-like changes in programs for Spanish surname pupils then classified EMR; district responsibility for possible misidentification was emphasized. Following legislative mandates, State Department of Education responsibilities were more extensive, including preparation of guidelines and procedures for use at the district level in implementing new regulations, collection of appropriate statistics regarding reclassified pupils and transition programs for them, and monitoring and reporting on program progress. A 1972 publication detailing assessment procedures for diagnosis of educable mentally retarded pupils (Lambert, Gleason, & Wilcox) was developed by representatives of the College and University Educators of School Psychologists, the project funded under Title VI-B through the Division of Special Education of the State Department of Education. The manual provides detailed procedures for assessment of pupils, taking into account consideration of adaptive behaviors and basic skills, as well as the usual more traditional cognitive abilities. The point to be made is that although court and legislative action dramatically influenced the conduct of EMR programs throughout the State, particularly where ethnic minorities were involved, there had been considerable prior activity leading to changes in the direction which became mandated by law. Transition or

supplemental efforts, thus, have to be viewed as outcomes of a number of convergent influences.

Legislative Action

Recognizing inequities in educational programs and subsequent legal mandates for their reform, the California State Legislature considered new legislation in two major areas. The first area had to do essentially with identification, selection, and placement practices, the second with supplementary educational (i.e. transition) programs for pupils returning to regular education programs. Major legislative action during the years 1970-1972 has been reviewed in detail in an SERP Technical Report 1974-A3 (Keogh, Levitt, & Robson), available through the UCLA Special Education Research Program. Several pieces of legislature are directly relevant to the present report, thus, are considered briefly.

Assembly Bill 1625 was entered into the Statutes of California for 1970 as Chapter 1543. This Chapter acted to add Sections 6902.06, 6902.08, 6902.09 and 6902.10 to the Education Code of California. Section 6902.06 had to do withthe use of intelligence tests for determination of eligibility for admission to EMR programs, requiring specifically that tests be administered in the "primary home language in which the minor is most fluent and has the best speaking ability and capacity to understand." Section 6902.08 stipulated that all minors then enrolled in special education programs for the mentally retarded should be retested before the end of the 1970 calendar year in order to determine the appropriateness of their placement in such programs. Section 6902.09 for the mentally retarded pursuant to Section 6902.08 "...shall be withdrawn from such a program upon consultation with his parents or guardian," and may be placed in a supplementary educational program designed to accelerate his

adjustment to instruction in the regular classroom. Section 6902.10 required the Superintendent of Public Instruction to report to the State Board of Education those districts in which a significant variance existed between the racial and ethnic composition of classes for mentally retarded minors and the general district enrollment. Assembly Bill 1625 also added Sections 18102.11 and 18102.12 to the Education Code. These sections dealt with allowances to school districts and County superintendents of schools for the support of "supplemental education programs" to facilitate the transition of qualified pupils from special education classes for mentally retarded minors into regular classrooms. The legislative basis for transition programs, thus, was determined in this 1970 action.

A second measure dealing with revised criteria for placing minors in special education classes for the mentally retarded was Senate Bill 1317 entered into the Statutes of California for 1970 as Chapter 1569. Senate Bill 1317 added Section 6902.07 to the Education Code, specifying more precise requirements for determination of eligibility of minors for placement in a special education program for the mentally retarded. This section stated that: "No minor shall be placed in a special education class for the mentally retarded if he scores higher than two standard deviations below the norm...on an individual intelligence test selected from a list approved by the State Board of Education. No minor shall be placed in a special education program for the mentally retarded when he is being tested in a language other than English if he scores higher than two standard deviations below the norm...on the nonverbal intelligence test or on the nonverbal portion of an intelligence test which includes both verbal and nonverbal portions."

During its 1971 regular session, the California Legislature approved

Senate Bill 33, which stated essentially that children of all ethnic, socioeconomic, and cultural backgrounds should be served in the regular classroom if possible. The Bill was concerned also with questions of proportional representation of socioeconomic and ethnic groups in classes for the mentally retarded, as well as specifying some policies and procedures in identification and placement of pupils. To quote: "Before any minor is admitted to a special education program for mentally retarded minors established pursuant to this chapter..., the minor shall be given verbal or nonverbal individual intelligence tests in the primary home language in which the minor is most fluent and has the best speaking ability and capacity to understand. Such tests shall be selected from a list approved by the State Board of Education."

Senate Bill 33 acted to add further safeguards to prevent improper placement of minors in special education programs for the mentally retarded. Therese further safeguards were specifically: that the psychological examination by a credentialed school psychologist required for the placement of a minor in a special education program must add estimates of adaptive behavior, including a visit, with consent of parent or guardian, to the minor's home by the school psychologist or other properly designated person to interview members of the minor's family in the language of the home; that written permission for the individual psychological evaluation must be secured from the minor's parent or guardian or his duly authorized representative in a conference with a school official; that the recommendation to be made to the admissions committee be discussed by the school psychologist with the parent, guardian, or authorized representative; that a discussion between school psychologist and parent, guardian or authorized representative be held to consider the conclusion reached by the committee and to obtain written parental authorization for placement of the minor;

and, that permission documents for psychological evaluation and for placement must be both in English and in the parental home language, and, similarly, conferences and notices to inform parent or guardian of placement committee conclusion and special education programs must be in the language of the minor's parent or guardian. SB 33 stated further that beginning with the 1971-72 school year, annual reports by each school district should be made to the Department of Education including the ethnic breakdown of children presently and newly placed in special education classes for the mentally retarded either by the standard admission procedure or by the unanimous consent procedure specified in this section. Such reports were to include an explanation of a 15% or greater variation of any minority representation in special education classes for the mentally retarded compared with district population as a whole.

Major legislative action during 1972 had to do with mainly clarification of specific definitional or operational points, and extension of the funding for transition programs for another two year period, that is, until July 1, 1974. It may be seen, thus, that considerable attention of the State Legislature was directed at aspects of identification, placement, and educational programs for pupils formerly or potentially within the traditionally defined educable mentally retarded classification.

Program Changes

Major direct results of litigation and legislation were changes in practices of evaluation, re-evaluation, and placement of pupils under new criteria specified in the California Education Code (Chapters 43 and 69 of the 1970 Statutes). Under these changes over 22,000 California pupils were reclassified from EMR status and returned to regular educational programs (Hanson, 1974). Incidence figures (see Table 1) for EMR placement,

especially for the period 1964-74, reflect, in part at least, new and more rigorous criteria for identification. It is, of course, difficult to know from the summary figures whether the EMR enrollment drops reflect directly the changes brought about by legislative and court action for re-evalutation and reclassification of pupils already categorized EMR, or whether they are a function of fewer pupils originally classified EMR, attrition due to older EMR pupils leaving school as graduates or dropouts, or reclassification to another special education category. The figures document clearly the fewer numbers of pupils in the EMR classification.

Districts could receive supplemental support funds under transition legislation but were given wide option for specifics of program implementation. In an April, 1971, communication to County and district superintendents from the Division of Special Education and Division of Instruction (Gonzales and Brinegar), six innovative and exemplary models of transition programs were suggested: Resource Learning Center; Consulting Teacher; Ancillary Teacher Assistant; Inservice Training Programs; Pupil Personnel Consultants; Bilingual Consultants. All of the prototypes were fundable under Education Code Section 18102.11. In a project conducted under contract with the State Department of Education, Britton (1972) found five different program models in the six districts studied: transition class; individual tutorial, itinerant teacher, learning disability group; or, resource learning center. It seems likely that variations on any of these models may be found, suggesting a variety and diversity of methods of implementation. Such diversity may speak well for individual responsibility and ingenuity at the district level, but, of course, makes systematic program review and monitoring difficult.

Guidelines from the State Department tended to be general and to deal with intent of the legislation rather than to provide directions for

Table 1

Number of Pupils Enrolled in EMR Programs

1960-1974

School Year	EMR Enrollment	School Year	EMR Enrollment
1960-61	37,421	1967-68	55,868
1961-62	47,060	1968-69	57,148
1962-63	45,008	1969-70	54,078
1963-64	48,388	1970-71	47,864
1964-65	51,461	1971-72	38,208
1965-66	52,157	1972-73	33,091
1966-67	54,338	1973-74	29,609

Figures supplied by State Department of Education

program specifics. Guidelines used in 1971 may be found in Appendix B. It should be remembered, too, that transition programs were optional, not required, and were originally viewed as two year interim arrangements. Not all districts chose to utilize transition program funding, although all were obligated to respond to the selection and placement sections of the legislation. As found in Britton's summary (1972), the State Department of Education reported that 4144 pupils were served in supplemental programs as of April, 1971, that number almost doubling by 1972, when the average daily attendance for State funded transition programs was 7965.16. In April, 1971, 122 districts had State funded transition programs under Education Code 18102.11, this number having increased to 240 districts and 9 county superintendents' offices in 1972. Thus, despite the temporary nature of the supplemental funding, almost 250 school districts in the state developed formally approved transition programs. It is likely, of course, that this figure represents only a proportion of the total number of supplemental efforts provided by local districts, in that many districts did not make formal transition program arrangements through the State; some worked with pupils with particular needs on individual bases, or provided other unofficial transition arrangements.

Program Effects

Legislation dealing with criteria for classification and with procedures to determine eligibility for classification, was directed, in part at least, at negative effects of labeling children on the basis of limited and possibly prejudicial tests and at overcoming known inequities in educational programs. The importance of recognition of other adaptive skills and abilities and the inequities of traditional practices in IQ testing for children of minority cultures have been well documented (Mercer 1970, 1974; Lambert, Gleason, & Wilcox, 1972). The possibly

negative and insidious effects of labeling as EMR have been emphasized (Jones, 1972). Accurate identification, classification, and appropriate placement in educational programs is clearly mandated, both legally and morally. Implementation of positive programs for individual pupils is, unfortunately, not always an easy task, and program effects are often unknown.

It must be recognized that a number of pupils formerly placed in segregated EMR programs and returned to regular programs lacked academic skills to ensure or allow educational success in regular classes. Analyzing achievement data of 263 California EMR pupils, Keogh, Becker, Kukic, and Kukic (1972) found that EMR pupils as a group were over four years behind grade level expectancy in arithmetic and spelling. No major differences in achievement patterns were found for subgroups of pupils according to size or ethnic characteristics of the districts. It seems possible that there was a circular effect of EMR placement such that pupils inaccurately identified and placed in special programs for EMR were provided educational experiences which served to limit, rather than enhance their educational skills. Thus, when accurately re-evaluated, many of these pupils achieved at a level below their grade level expectancies although their abilities were not deficient. The point to be made is that in some instances reclassification from EMR status was not necessarily associated with academic success in regular education programs. Referring to the national trend in placement of special pupils in regular classes, Cohen and DeYoung (1973) note:

> "...a closer look at the situation presents a dismal picture Children being returned to the regular classes are provided little of the necessary additional support, enrichment, and remedial services which will redress the effects of their prior educational experiences and permit them to function at the level of other students in the regular classes. Apparently, they are not expected to do well, and many will not.

> It seems certain that the blame for their failure will be placed on the children, rather than on a system that will not modify itself and its resources to meet their particular needs (p. 270)."

Comprehensive supplemental help for pupils returning to regular programs is clearly indicated.

Despite the somewhat discouraging finding regarding academic achievement, there is evidence from a number of studies to support a more optimistic view of the integration of pupils of low academic performance into regular programs. Gampel, Gottlieb, and Harrison (1974) reported the positive effects of peer models and the regular class environment on classroom behaviors of formerly segregated EMR pupils, findings consistent with earlier work in which segregated EMR pupils were found to exhibit more hostile and aggressive behaviors than did integrated EMR pupils (Gampel, Harrison, & Budoff, 1972). Using classroom behavioral observations, Guerin and Satzlocky (1974) found that EMR pupils integrated into regular classes had a high rate of successful behaviors, so that they were not identifable from normal achieving children in regular programs. Guerin and Satzlocky also identified differences in pupils' behaviors relative to degree of integration in regular programs, clearly implicating the integration model provided. Independent support from positive effects of integrated placement may be found in Flynn's (1974) study of promotion rates. Findings from an ongoing program in Texas, Programmed Re-entry Into Mainstream Education (PRIME) should provide data specifying effects of pupil characteristics and program models (Texas Education Agency, 1974).

Based in interviews with pupils, teachers, and parents in six school districts having transition programs, Birtton (1972) concluded in general that transition programs were successful. The majority of his pupils were making adequate adjustment to regular class programs,

according to self-reports, and the reports of parents and teachers. Pupils in Britton's study were still below grade level in academic performance. Teachers estimated that over two-thirds of the transition pupils in this study required additional help before full integration could be a reality. Britton noted, too, that comprehensive transition programs were more difficult to implement on the secondary than the elementary levels. In contrast to Guerin and Satzlocky (1974) Britton found relatively few differences among outcomes, at least on his measures, according to particular program models, with the exception of the special transition class which was least effective. Evaluation of two instructional systems implemented within the same administrative arrangements in the Los Angeles School District also yielded no differences according to program. Importantly, however, pupils in both transition programs exceeded levels of educational improvement (Los Angeles Unified School District Report No. 340, 1974). In this comprehensive study of transition programs in the Los Angeles District, input from over 842 teachers, 2,000 pupils, 244 principals, and 1,241 parents was interpreted to demonstrate overall success for the district's transition program. Positive evaluations were stronger at the elementary than secondary levels.

Determination of program efficacy and of outcome effects is complex and multifaceted, requiring long term intensive effort. Comprehensive evaluation of 18102.11 programs is difficult, at least, as many programs have been discontinued, and systematic data are not available. Study of transition programs, however, may provide direction as to appropriate and feasible ways of integrating special pupils into the regular educational program, a direction consistent with Master Plan goals.

Goals of the Project

California school districts have been involved in major efforts to make identification and screening practices equitable, and to develop programs which maximize successful return to regular classes of pupils formerly classified as EMR. Such efforts are consistent with philosophic directions in special education and with court and legislative mandates which govern program operation. At present there is limited evidence to determine the effectiveness of changed practices and little information as to most efficient and effective program organization. Pertinent efficacy data include followup of pupils who participated in the various programs, and consideration of the programs which serve these pupils. The first question is being investigated by UCR-USC in their study of transition effects. Programmatic aspects have been the focus of this study by the UCLA Special Education Research Program staff.

This project was planned and carried out to gather systematic data regarding educational programs implemented through legislation under Chapters 1543 and 1569 of the Statutes of the State of California, the so-called "transition" programs. The project was conducted with the cooperation of the State Department of Education and local school districts having such programs. Focus in this project was on delineation of the kinds of programmatic modifications developed by districts to provide supplemental services, the procedures and methods used to identify and review pupils for eligibility for programs, the kinds of staff development utilized, the techniques of evaluation of program effectiveness, and the recommendations and suggestions of district professionals as to ways to improve services for pupils in transition status. The approach taken in this project was non-evaluative. Our intent was not to determine if programs had or had not been effective, but rather to find out what, in fact,

happened in districts implementing such supplemental programs.

Procedures

In order to provide a detailed review of California transition programs a two phase study was developed. The first phase involved development of a comprehensive interview schedule (Appendix C) and the subsequent interviewing of ten district administrators responsible for identification of pupils and "transition" programs in their districts. These data provided "in depth" understanding of program operation in the ten districts and served as the basis for work in Phase 2. The second phase involved development of a mail questionnaire (Appendix D) sent to all school districts in California (N = 227) which had applied for and were approved to be funded for transition programs under 18102.11 of the Education Code. Content was derived largely from responses of district personnel interviewed in Phase I. Findings in this report are confined to data from the comprehensive interviews in the ten selected districts and to results obtained from the questionnaire.

Phase I

District Sample

A four step sampling design was utilized to select representative school districts in California (Keogh, et al., 1972). Ten districts in California were chosen on the basis of: district size, community SES school district organization, and ethnicity of the school population. A list of the districts may be found in Appendix E.

Size. There were three large, three medium, three small, and one "super" large district in the sample. These districts ranged in size (ADA) from approximately 4,900 to 60,000.

Ethnic Representation. Where possible within each size category, a "high" density ethnic group was represented for three different ethnic groupings: Black, Chicano, and Anglo.* "High" ethnic density ranged, for Blacks: 28-85%; for Chicanos: 33-69%; and for Anglos: 78-90%.

Community SES. In previous work in which SES has been defined independently in terms of assessed valuation of school districts, Hansen (1970) found that SES and ethnic density were highly correlated. In the present study no independent measure of community SES was utilized separate from ethnic representation.

School District Organization. Within size groupings districts were selected in terms of administrative structure, i.e., unified, elementary only, secondary only. When combined with other sample parameters, administrative differentiation was found to be applicable only for small districts.

Special Education Programs. All districts sampled had formal programs of special education serving a variety of exceptionalities. It is interesting to note that no district reported the use of a self-contained transition class for former EMR students.

Interview Respondents

Interview respondents held a variety of titles, although each performed essentially the same functions in terms of bearing primary responsibility for the development and administration of transition programs in the respective districts. Six administrators interviewed were Coordinators and Directors of Special Education, two were Directors of Pupil Personnel Services, one was a School Psychologist, and one an Assistant

*In this study "Anglo" represents the State Department of Education figures for "Other White."

Superintendent. In nine of the 10 participating districts, one administrator was interviewed, while in the remaining district, two were interviewed. All administrators were Anglo, 10 of the 11 men.

Interviews

Two UCLA post-graduate research assistants conducted five interviews each for a total of 10 interviews, one in each of the sample districts. A letter was sent to the appropriate office in each district detailing the research project and requesting district participation in the study. All districts responded favorably to the interview request and consented to participate in the study. Interviews were conducted during a three month period from November, 1973, to January, 1974. Each interview lasted approximately two hours and covered the operation and administration of decertification and transition programs in the district.

All interviews were conducted according to a preconstructed interview schedule developed by the investigators (see Appendix C). Interview questions required short, factual answers; however, the interview was structured so as to allow the respondents to provide qualitative and quantitative input not covered or needing elaboration. This "open-ended" section of the interview was conducted during the latter portion of the interview. Post hoc review of the interview data between interviewers (interrater reliability) revealed a high degree of correspondence. No significant discrepancies or differences in response reporting were apparent.

Phase II

The research in Phase II was designed to fulfill two interrelated goals: (1) to cross validate or check the data generated in Phase I; and, (2) to provide a more comprehensive look at administrators' perceptions

of the implementation, operation, and future directions of transition programs, including administrators' views of program effects on pupils. It is important to emphasize that this project was not an efficacy study. It was not aimed at evaluating the relative worth or value of any specific transition program or model. Rather, the project was designed to illuminate and describe aspects of the California experience in integrating pupils in regular programs, and to document administrators' perceptions and observations regarding the planning, implementation, and outcomes of transition programs. Direct questions of efficacy are relevant, timely and desirable. However, it is necessary to establish a broad data base, as in this project, before specific or general questions of program efficacy are undertaken.

District Sample

The basic sample for Phase II of the project came from a listing of all districts approved for transition funding for 1972-73 and/or 1973-74; this list was obtained from the State Department of Education. Districts contacted for this study are listed in Appendix F. Only these approved districts were contacted, although other districts may have conducted transition programs without assistance of State funds; such districts are not represented in the sample base in this study. A packet containing a letter of introduction, explanation of the project, and requests for participation, along with a questionnaire (see Appendix D), and a stamped, self-addressed, return envelope was mailed to each district (N = 227) on the approved list. If, within one month from the mailing of this initial letter, a district had not responded, a second followup request for participation was sent. No further followup was pursued.

Of the 227 districts contacted (initial request only or initial request plus a followup request), 171 or 75.3% responded. Of that 171,

15 (or 6.6% of the total 227 districts contacted) declined to participate. Completed questionnaires were returned by 156 districts (68.6% of the 227 contacted). Two districts were not included in the final analysis as data were incomplete or received after computer processing. Districts declining research requests typically offered the following reasons for not participating: "...even though we were authorized a program by the state, we did not implement the authorization, and we have not had a transition program for the past two years..;" "...we have not decertified any EMR pupils;" "circumstances presently prevent us from giving your project the time required..;" "...This school district does not have a transition program for EMRs..;" "...due to the pressure of work in the office at this time of the year, it will not be possible for us to participate..;" "I haven't got the time."

In a few cases two or more districts combined after the approved list was generated by the State Department of Education, in a sense reducing the basis sample pool to 225. Districts with changed names are listed at the end of the District list in Appendix F. Distribution of sample district according to ADA may be found in Table 2.

Table 2

Districts According to ADA Number and Percent of Sample

Size Category	ADA Range	Number	Percent
Tiny	900	24	15.4
Small	901- 7,999	70	44.9
Medium	8,000-24,999	50	32.1
Large	24,000-59,999	9	5.8
Super	60,000	3	1.9
TOTAL		156	100.0

Sample districts served a broad grade and age span, and were organized in differing administrative patterns. Table 3 contains a summary description of sample districts according to grades served.

Table 3

Number and Percent of Sample Districts in Various Grade Level Groupings

Category	Number	Percent
K- 6	13	8.4
K- 8	46	29.9
K-12	72	46.8
7-12	6	3.9
9-12	17	11.0
TOTAL	154*	100.0

*Two districts did not report grades served.

Information as to ethnic characteristics of districts was obtained from the California State Department of Education Bureau of Intergroup Relations. On the basis of this information districts were placed in one of four categories according to number or percent representation of the three major ethnic subgroups; Anglo, Black, or Spanish Surname. Categories were 0-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, and 76% or greater. A summary of districts according to percent of ethnic representation may be found in Table 4.

Table 4

Number and Percent of Districts in Each Category of Ethnic Representation

N = 156

Group	Percent Ethnic School Population			
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76%+
American Indian	156(100.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Anglo	7(4.5%)	21(13.5%)	42(26.9%)	86(55.1%)
Asian	155(99.4%)	1(0.6%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Black	149(95.5%)	5(3.2%)	1(0.6%)	1(0.6%)
Spanish Surname	114(73.1%)	25(16.0%)	15(9.6%)	2(1.3%)

Questionnaire

The Questionnaire (Appendix D) required the respondents to check various items or provide data pertinent to the implementation, planning, and carrying out of reclassification and transition programs. The questionnaire also allowed for comments to be made regarding both specific and general issues. Major issues covered in the questionnaire were: the identification and reclassification process; transition program organization; adequacy of funding; staff development or inservice training; administrators' attitudes and perceptions about decertification, transition, and program effects on pupils. Instructions were simply "Please check or fill in appropriate responses." On many items, e.g., 1, 10, 11, etc., multiple responses were possible. Where multiple responses occurred, coding categories were designed to accommodate multiple categories as a single response unit. All data were coded for a computer tabulation and were analyzed along various sample parameters: size of district, grades served, and ethnic density.

Results

Findings in this project are reported in two major sections. The first section contains summarizing information from in-depth interviews of administrators in ten selected school districts throughout the State; the second summarizes information supplied by questionnaire respondents from a large number of school districts operating approved transition programs.

Interview Findings

Interviews conducted with district administrators responsible for the implementation and direction of transition programs covered these topics: reclassification procedures, funding, organization for instruction, personnel, inservice training, transition pupils, and evaluative comments of administrators. Each of the ten districts interviewed offered district-wide transition programs for students transferred from special day classes for mentally retarded minors to regular programs. However, specific matters relative to organization and operation of programs varied by district. Questions and topics covered in the interviews may be found in Appendix C.

Reclassification Procedures

Administrators in all ten districts interviewed reported that they had reclassified pupils from their EMR program. However, one district reported that their program was not a reaction to the legislative change, but rather that they had re-evaluated pupils under their own initiative because they felt that a few of their pupils had been misclassified due to emotional problems not considered in previous testing. Re-evaluation

programs were under the administrative direction of the Coordinator of Direction of Special Education in 7 districts, the Director of Pupil Personal Services in one, and the Assistant Superintendent in charge of educational services along with the School Psychologist in one.

Initial reviews for decertification took place in 1968-69 in one district, not until 1970-71 in three others. All 10 districts reported that all EMR classified pupils were reviewed. However, this review varied, eight districts reporting that existing test data were the only criteria used in the initial review while all EMR pupils were retested in two districts. In two of the districts teachers' evaluations were also considered. Once the initial list of candidates for possible reclassification was compiled, four districts retested all of these pupils; two retested if existing test data were over two years old; one if test data were over three years old. In two districts pupils with borderline scores were retested, while one district reported that pupils were "redlined" on the basis of existing test data, no other reevaluation attempted. The formal decision to reclassify rested with the A & D committee in all cases. Analysis of interview respondents' descriptions of reclassification procedures suggested that the prime influence on A & D Committee decisions was psychometric data about a pupil. Achievement test scores, as well as I.Q., were regularly considered, and classroom behavior and adjustment were sometimes factors in decisions about individual pupils. Overall there was heavy reliance on test scores.

Since the initial review all 10 districts reported that all pupils in EMR programs are reviewed yearly and retested at least every three years. Yearly review includes teachers' evaluations, parents' requests, psychologists' recommendations, and principals' recommendations. Such reports are used in considering students for possible reclassification.

A number of district administrators reported that the composition of EMR classes changed as a result of transition programs. The classes now have lower average I.Q. pupils and tend to be less advanced in academic level. Three districts reported a lower percentage of Chicano students in EMR programs.

Funding

Funding structures and guidelines for transition programs were provided by the Department of Education under Senate Bill 529 and Assembly Bill 1625. Transition funding provided under these bills expired on July 1, 1972, the expiration date extended to July 1, 1974 by Senate Bill 171. Eight of the 10 districts interviewed elected to receive extended transition funding under SB 171. A detailed legislative history of these measures and their entry into the Education Code of California is documented in another report (Keogh, Levitt, Robson, 1974) and is covered briefly in the present report.

Based on information gathered through interviews with administrators, it may be seen that districts differed in how transition funds were applied. Some utilized transition funds to develop and implement new supplemental education programs; some hired paraprofessional tutors; others used teachers and other resources already existing within the district. In nine districts State monies balanced evenly with disbursements for transition programs, while one district reported that transition expenses exceeded monies received. One district administrator noted that the receipt of State funding was tardy. Administrators in seven of the 10 districts expressed the opinion that funding under Senate Bill 529 and Assembly Bill 1625 was insufficient to meet district needs for planning and providing transition programs. Only one district reported matching State and district funds, thus doubling monies directed toward transition

programs.

Organization for Instruction

Of the ten districts interviewed, nine reported use of the regular classroom as a "home base" to which other transition support services could be delivered. Most districts used extra or additional support personnel (regularly credentialed personnel and/or paraprofessional aides) to provide individual help for transition pupils in regular classrooms. These extra support personnel were used in varying combinations of itinerant and resource room situations. One district used high school students as tutors to work with elementary transition students. Only one district reported using a "teaching specialist" (speech, language and hearing) to work with transition pupils in the regular class. One smaller district reported an LDG arrangement and an "opportunity class" as a possibility for placement of transition students. It is of importance to note that no district in this sample instituted self-contained classrooms for transition students, although in one district all transition students were placed in classrooms for educationally handicapped (EH) students. Three other districts reported to use their EH programs on a partial basis for transition students. In the larger districts a number of regular classrooms at any given grade level were available for the placement of transition pupils. Where such conditions existed, transition pupils were transferred from their centrally located special day classes to regular classrooms located in their residential neighborhoods and determined to be appropriate individual placements.

In sum, the regular classroom was used as the primary base of operation for transition pupils. Most districts reported using additional support personnel to aid the regular class teacher receiving transition students. When other support services were used by districts the regular

classroom appeared to remain as the point of origin for the actual delivery of ancillary services.

Teaching Personnel

Transition teaching personnel varied widely in training and background, ranging from regularly and specifically (EMR) credentialed teachers to lay persons from the local community hired as paraprofessionals. Teaching personnel in transition programs performed a variety of roles including those of itinerant teacher, resource room teacher, and teacher's aide serving in a regular classroom. In the operational sense, virtually all of these instructional roles performed by transition teaching personnel resulted in one-to-one tutorial situations. One district reported using only former EMR teachers in transition teaching roles, and three districts stated that approximately 60% of their transition teaching personnel were former EMR teachers. Another district employed only paraprofessionals as tutors, whereas five reported that approxiamtely 60% of their tutors for transition students were paraprofessionals. A small number of regular classroom teachers were reported to be used as transition tutors. One district stated the 10% of their transition teaching personnel were newly credentialed regular classroom teachers.

Several criteria were used by administrators interviewed when selecting transition teaching personnel. Four stressed the ability to plan and implement individualized teaching programs, three emphasized past experience with special education pupils, two felt training with regular students to be important, and two stated that knowledge of curriculum was a significant selection criterion for transition personnel. Other standards for selection reported by administrators for selection were: ability to relate to normal children, not being "EMR oriented," ability to tolerate deviant behavior, emotional stability, flexibility, and eagerness.

No district stressed holding tenure, volunteered services, or simple availability or criteria for transition teacher selection.

Inservice Training

Inservice training sessions were conducted by seven districts as an aspect of their transition programs. Three of these districts provided training for transition tutors only. One district trained transition tutors and teacher aids, and one provided inservice help for transition tutors as well as for the school psychologist and regular classroom teachers who received transition pupils. Regular classroom teachers and teacher aids were given inservide training in the two remaining districts. No specialized inservice training was provided for principals or EMR classroom teachers. Within the sample inservice efforts were directed primarily at special instructional personnel, particularly tutors, with only three of the ten districts providing inservice preparation for regular class teachers who received transition pupils and only one expanding inservice to include psychologists.

Administration of inservice training programs in these seven districts varied widely. In three of these districts, an administrator of special education conducted the inservice training sessions. As example, in one of these three districts, the Senior Consultant for Special Education instructed the school psychologists, who in turn instructed regular classroom teachers and transition tutors. In another district, the Coordinator of Special Education trained transition tutors and teacher aides. In the third district, the Director of Pupil Personnel Services trained both regular classroom teachers and teacher aides. Two other districts employed private consultants to conduct inservice training. The consultant in one of these districts worked with transition tutors only, conducting training in behavior modification, the use of learning

centers, and individualization of instruction. The second district, using a private consultant, trained both classroom teachers and teacher aides. In still another district, selected course work at a local college served as training for transition tutors. The remaining district provided inservice training to all its transition tutors but did not report administrative details of its program.

As a result of the movement of pupils from special day classes for mentally retarded minors into regular classrooms, some districts had a surplus of teachers serving EMR pupils. Some administrators reported that only the teachers viewed by administrators to be most effective with EMR pupils remained as teachers in these programs. Although not all interview respondents had figures available reflecting the placement of such surplus teachers, the following categories of changes in assignment for teachers of EMR were frequently mentioned: returned to the regular classroom; left the district; became transition tutors; became teachers of EH pupils.

Transition Pupils

According to administrators transition pupils as a group tended not to vary from the specific EMR population from which they were drawn in terms of sex, age, SES,or ethnicity. Said differently, transition pupils were characteristic of the ethnic and SES majority of the district, in a sense representing the "model" pupil. Predominately Anglo districts reclassified Anglo pupils; predominately Black districts reclassified Black pupils. As would be expected from their higher I.Q. scores which made them eligible for transition placement, according to administrators' reports, transition students were superior in academic performance to EMR students who had not been reclassified. Pupil characteristics were not withing the purview of this project, but will be reported as part of the cooperative study

being conducted through the University of California at Riverside and the University of Southern California. Depressed levels of academic performance in EMR classrooms was the major reported change resulting from the movement of decertified students to "regular" status.

Administrators' Evaluative Comments

At the conclusion of the administrative interviews, respondents were requested to answer three open-ended questions getting at their personal perceptions of both decertification and transition programs. The first two questions had to do with suggested changes in existing decertification and transition statutes, the third directed at possible continuation of transition programs after state funding terminated.

The first question posed to administrators was, "What changes would you suggest in the decertification laws?" Four districts' administrators made no response to this question; however, the remaining six offered specific suggestions which were directed at program operation. It is important to emphasize that all six of these districts stressed the need for program provisions leading to greater attention to the individual needs of pupils considered for decertification. One administrator stated that pupils designated for reclassification for EMR should be allowed to remain in the EMR classrooms as a sort of home base, and that they should gradually be integrated into hand-picked classrooms. This integration should take place during those times when particular academic subject matter was being presented and only as skill levels of individual decertified students warranted such integration. Another district indicated that certain pupils whose primary language was other than English should remain in EMR classrooms where optimal academic help would be forthcoming. Despite the fact that such individual students might have I.Q. scores slightly above two standard deviations below the mean, continued EMR

placement was recommended. The administrator in this district apparently felt that regular classroom placement for such individual pupils might be detrimental to their educational advancement. A third administrator stated that all pupils considered for reclassification should be evaluated with primary reference to their individual potential for success in the regular classroom, rather than being automatically decertified on the basis of a rigid I.Q. cut-off point. The response from a fourth district was simply that more individualization in reclassification was needed and that the I.Q. demarcation for decertification should be changed. The remaining two districts responding to the question of possible change in reclassification statutes suggested revision touching on greater consideration for individual decertified students. Among recommendations were the need for longitudinal follow-up services, and for possible state intervention to prevent misplacement of decertified students.

The second open-ended question presented to administrators was, "What changes would you suggest in the transition laws?" Five districts chose not to respond to this question. Of the five districts' administrators responding, three felt transition funding to be inadequate. One of these three districts stated that not only should transition funding be increased, but that it should be extended to all regular classroom from any special self-contained classroom for the handicapped. Another proposed that transition funding be continuous and further stated that state support should be expanded to include curricular and media aids adaptable to variation in learning rates among transition pupils. The third district administrator simply stated that transition funding should be more adequate. In the two remaining districts, one administrator felt that transition funding ought to become a permanent part of state funding for special education, and more specifically, that such funding should be written into the California Master

Plan for Special Education. Opinion in the final district was radically different; namely, that transition funding might well have been discontinued after its initial two years, the administrator in this district suggesting that transition programs should have been brought to a successful conclusion within the first two-year time span.

The final open-ended question directed to administrators was, "When the state funding for transition programs runs out, will the district continue to provide transition programs?" Two districts gave no response, three were unsure in their responses, and five gave definitely negative responses. Whereas two of the districts responding negatively gave an unqualified "no," another district responding negatively indicated that the district could not afford the financial burden alone, and a fourth district replied that it could not afford to spend its own assets, although regretting that it must discontinue its program. The remaining district which responded in the negative felt that there whould be no need to continue transition training if admission procedures to EMR classes were proper. The three district administrators who were unsure whether or not they would be able to continue transition programs indicated disappointment in the probability that they could not do so. One of these districts planned to make a request for funds to the local district Board, and planned to continue to serve transition students who might be eligible for support from some other source, possibly using EH funds.

During the course of the open-ended conversations, several administrators stated that a number of parents wanted their reclassified children to remain in EMR classes. These parents had reported that their children were initially confident academically upon being placed in the regular classroom, but that increased pressures in the new "regular" setting prompted academic failure and generated feelings of insecurity and frus-

tration in these decertified children.

In summary, administrators interviewed tended to have mixed opinions of the effect of reclassification and transition programs mandated by the State. Pessimism was expressed about the problems many pupils had in adapting emotionally and academically to the regular classroom. Insufficiency of transition funding provided by the state to aid decertified students in the regular classrooms and loss of work study program options for many high school students were also noted. Generally, however, administrators agreed that reclassification and transition policies corrected improper placement in EMR classes for a number of pupils. It seemed clear that there was support for the intent and direction of the program, but some real problems in terms of implementation and operation.

Questionnaire Results

The findings in this section are based on responses from 156 or 71% of the school districts contacted. In all cases information was supplied by the school official administratively responsible for transition program operation. Findings are summarized to describe major aspects of transition programs: procedures for identification, evaluation, and the classification of pupils; instructional or organizational options utilized in transition placement; staff development and inservice support for the program; evaluation of program efficacy and effects; and administrators' perceptions of the program.

Procedures for Reclassification

Considering first questions of how districts identified, re-evaluated, and determined placement of pupils for transition programs, 84% or 131 of the 156 districts responding indicated that records of all pupils in EMR programs were reviewed. Sixty-eight districts (44%) also indicated that teachers of EMR programs nominated pupils for review, and 77 (49%) indicated that school psychologists nominated pupils for review for possible placement. Twenty-five (16%) of the districts indicated that parents also nominated pupils and eight (5%) specified that pupils themselves asked to be reviewed. Thus, districts used many sources to nominate pupils for review, the majority routinely re-evaluating or examining records of all pupils in EMR programs. Only 40 districts (approximately 25%) made decisions about reclassification of pupils on the basis of prior information; that is, primarily on the basis of previous test scores, cumulative record evidence, and so forth. On the contrary, 51% of the districts responding to this question indicated that fewer than 10% of the pupils were

reclassified on the basis of prior information. On hundred nineteen districts (78%) of those responding to the question indicated that most of the decisions about pupils for transition placement were made on the basis of then current, i.e., new or recent, re-evaluation and retesting by the school psychometrist or school psychologists.

Degree of minority ethnic representation within districts was a major and important influence on transition placement. Because Anglos are the majority group in California public schools, by actual count more Anglo pupils than any other ethnic group pupils were reclassified and placed in transition status. However, it is important to note that numbers of Spanish surname and Black pupils reclassified and placed in transition programs exceeded their proportional representation in the school population. In a sense, ethnic minorities were overrepresented in transition programs, suggesting that districts had carried out the intent of the legislation in attempting to correct possible inequities in placement of ethnic minority pupils in EMR programs. Districts with high Black and high Spanish surname representation had consistently higher percentage of pupils in transition programs than would be expected by district population parameters.

Less than 24% of the districts reported that there were pupils who met transition criteia and for whom school personnel recommended transition placement, but who remained in EMR classes at the request of the parent. In contrast, approximately one-third of the districts reported that there were pupils who technically still met the EMR criteria, but who were reclassified and placed in transition programs at the request of the parent. Over 78% of the districts involved parents at one or more stages of

the decision about re-evaluation and placement, 18% contacting parents prior to formal review, 29% contacting parents prior to placement decisions, and 24% contacting parents following decision for placement.

Program Options

Sixty-five percent of the 156 districts responding conducted transition programs in grades 4-6, and 71% operated programs in grades 7-9; approximately one-third of the districts placed transition pupils in primary grades. Almost half (49%) of the high school districts reported utilization of transition programming.

Considering the program options utilized by districts when placing reclassified pupils in other programs, it should be noted that a number of districts utilized other special education categories to accommodate pupils formerly classified as EMR. Seventy-seven districts (49% reporting) indicated that no EMR pupil was reclassified as EH, whereas two districts reclassified all former EMR transition pupils as EH, and two other districts reclassified as many as one-half of these pupils into EH programs. Thirteen districts placed as many as 25 or more pupils in EH programs. It is of interests, too, that 113 (72%) of the districts reported that none of the pupils formerly in EMR programs were placed in learning disability groups and only six districts (3%) utilized an LDG format for 25% or more of transition pupils. Ten districts (6%) reclassified a very small number of pupils as TMR, whereas the vast majority, 146 districts 94%, did not utilize this category to place transition or former EMR pupils. Four districts identified some former EMRs as multihandicapped

and only one district utilized the orthopedically handicapped category. It seems clear, thus, that the majority of districts provided special transition programs and did not use regularly or formerly established special education programs to accommodate the formerly classified EMR pupils.

In terms of actual placement, 23 of the districts (15%) utilized a self-contained transition class, but the major program option was regular class plus some extra help: a resource room (N = 47, 31%); paraprofessional aide (N = 61, 39%); or special education consultants (29% of the districts). Twenty-six districts (17%) utilized regular class placement without any special support, whereas the majority of those districts placing pupils in regular classes provided some sort of specialized support services. Itinerant tutors were also used. The findings as to placement after reclassification are summarized in Table 5. It should be emphasized that categories of program options are not mutually exclusive, and a district might opt for a variety of possibilities.

Inservice Training

Given that the majority of transition pupils were placed in regular classes, consideration of inservice or staff development was obviously important. Of 155 districts responding to the question, 80 (52%) indicated that there was district provided inservice training specifically directed at personnel involved with transition programs, whereas 75 districts (48%) responded "No" in this regard. For the 80 districts in which inservice was conducted, the bulk of the effort consisted of workshops, individual conferences with teachers about particular children, group conferences, and some limited use of outside consultants. For the most part, administrators indicated that inservice training was directed at regular class teachers

Table 5

Number and Percent of Districts Utilizing Transition and Placement Program Options*

N = 126

Program Type	Districts		
	Number	Percent**	Percent***
Self-contained transition classes	23	15%	18%
EH class	40	26%	32%
Regular class only	26	17%	21%
Regular class and resource room	47	30%	37%
Regular class and paraprofessional aide	61	39%	48%
Regular class and special education consultant	37	24%	29%
Regular class and school psychologist consultant	17	11%	14%
Itinerant tutors	49	31%	39%
LDGs	34	22%	27%
Other	12	o8%	10%

*Options were not mutually exclusive and some districts used more than one program type.

**Percent based on total number of districts in sample (N = 156)

***Percent based on number of districts responding to question (N = 126)

who were receiving transition pupils (N = 44, 28%), at resource room teachers (N = 24, 15%), at paraprofessionals (N = 36, 23%), and at itinerant tutors (N = 25, 16%). It is interesting to note from the summary of findings in Table 6 that there was very little inservice directed at any one but teachers. That is, only a small proportion of districts reported inservice training for school psychologists, principals, nurses, or other ancillary personnel, although all of these professionals were involved with transition pupils and programs. Most districts reported that inservice was conducted primarily by within-district persons (81%). It was the opinion of the administrators responding to the questions that inservice training was not entirely successful in preparing regular school personnel for returning reclassified pupils. Only 35% answered "Yes" to this question, 22% answering "No," and 44% answering that they were uncertain as to the effects of inservice.

In addition to responses obtained from the questionnaire, administrators made a number of subjective comments about inservice programs they viewed as successful. Suggestions included: workshops with regular receiving teachers, individual conferences, program planning sessions, discussions for regular teachers with special education consultants or school psychologists, small group meetings, and individual case conferences. Typical recommendations and comments were: "There needs to be much education of regular class teachers and administration before successful transition can be accomplished," "classroom teachers need to be made aware of the needs of children with learning problems and individualize instruction," "perhaps a systematic inservice program for principals would enable the principal to help his teachers deal more effectively with exceptional children," "more assistance in monitoring students while in regular classes is needed," "complete funding by State for small districts [is needed],"

Table 6

Number and Percent of Districts Providing
Inservice Training for Particular Target Groups*

	N	Percent**	Percent***
Regular class teachers receiving transition pupils	44	28%	55%
EMR class teachers	23	15%	29%
EH class teachers	13	08%	16%
School psychologists	14	09%	18%
LDG teachers	08	05%	10%
Resource room teachers	24	15%	30%
Building principals	12	08%	15%
School nurses	03	02%	04%
Paraprofessionals	36	23%	45%
Itinerant tutors	25	16%	31%
Others	10	06%	13%

*Categories are not mutually exclusive, thus, some districts included more than one target group in inservice training.

**Percent based on total number of districts in sample (N = 156)

***Percent based on number of districts conducting inservice (N = 80)

"supervised tutorial programs [and] more inservice for receiving teachers [is needed]."

In general, subjective comments reflected a need for more detailed and comprehensive inservice for both teaching and administrative personnel. These subjective comments were interpreted to suggest that inservice training was not entirely satisfactory in meeting needs of receiving teachers, school psychologists, or administrators who were involved with the return of former EMR pupils to regular classrooms. Although preparation of regular school staff for working effectively with transition pupils was viewed as an important aspect of transition programming, districts for the most part provided minimal or cursory efforts in this regard and there is considerable suggestion from the administrators involved that the results were at best equivocal.

Program Operation

Consideration of effect of the transition programs can be approached from several different points of view. Considering first some administrative aspects, two-thirds (67%) of the district administrators reported that they used State funds exclusively for the implementation of transition programs, 32% reporting a matching district and State funding pattern. Less than 2% used district funds exclusively. Over half (61%) of the district administrators reported that the funding was adequate for the program, and half reported that they did not use funds in excess of the State funds. In general, it appears that the funding was adequate for implementation of the transition programs, or perhaps, conversely, that the scope of programs was defined by the availability and amount of funding. Closely related to funding questions were aspects of program operation involving cooperation with the State Department of Education, the utilization of Department determined guidelines, and the like. A summary of administrator

Table 7

District Administrators' Views of Support Services for Transition Programs as Provided by the State Department of Education

47

Support Item	Total N Responding	Yes		No		Needed More Help	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Provided guidelines for implementation of Education Code regarding pupils	145	102	70	24	17	19	13
Provided guidelines for implementation of Education Code regarding transition programs	143	106	68	18	12	19	12
Provided information regarding administrative program development	132	42	27	60	39	30	19
Provided information regarding curricular and instructional matters	133	19	12	81	52	33	21
Provided information regarding program evaluation	136	54	35	54	35	28	18
Provided help with teacher inservice training programs	131	9	6	103	66	19	12
Provided help in the preparation of forms for funding and/or program approval	131	48	31	61	39	22	14

percentage based on total number of districts responding to each question

48

response to State Department of Education assistance in implementing the development of transition programs may be found in Table 7. Examination of percentages of "Yes," "No," and "Needed more help" responses suggests that the State Department of Education was viewed as helpful in providing guidelines for identification or decertification of pupils and for providing generalized guidelines for implementation of the program. However, examination of the other items in terms of program help suggests that administrators viewed as less adequate Department support regarding the development of administrative aspects of program development. Over 75% of the administrators responded that they needed more help or got no help from the Department regarding curricular or instructional matters, or for inservice training for teachers or other transition personnel. Over half of the respondents indicated that more help was needed, especially regarding program evaluation. In sum, these data suggest that the State Department of Education help was most positive when it came to funding matters and to generalized guidelines for identification and for placement of pupils in transition status. Administrators viewed Department help as limited, however, when it came to implementation of curricular, instructional, administrative, or evaluative aspects of the transition programs.

Program Effects

From the point of view of administrators' perceptions of program effects on pupils, it was clear that major benefits were seen in the area of social adjustment of transition pupils. Summary of agreement and disagreement and amount of uncertainty in regard to transition effects may be found in Table 8. Examination of the percent of agreement shown in Table 8 indicates clearly that over half of the administrators viewed improved social adjustment, improved self concept, and improved peer

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 8

District Administrators' Views of Effects of Transition Placement as Compared to Effects of Self-Contained EMR Placement

Item	Total N Responding	Agree		Disagree		Uncertain		No Change	
Transition placement		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Improved transition pupils' academic performance	150	70	45	25	16	41	26	14	09
Improved transition pupils' social adjustment	152	104	67	17	11	23	15	08	05
Improved transition pupils' classroom behavior	149	66	42	19	12	41	26	23	15
Improved transition pupils' self concept	152	98	63	14	09	33	21	07	05
Improved transition pupils' peer relationships	150	89	57	13	08	39	25	09	06
Removed the EMR stigma	147	80	51	14	09	48	31	05	03
Increased problems for regular class teachers	149	87	56	33	21	28	18	01	
Increased problems for regular class pupils	148	25	16	71	46	41	26	11	07
Decreased ethnic representation in EMR classes	149	43	28	44	28	23	15	39	25
Increased teachers' understanding and acceptance of problem children	148	46	30	32	21	55	35	15	10
Lowered academic performance of transition pupils	150	12	08	95	61	35	22	08	05

relationships as characterizing pupils in transition placement. Fifty one percent also felt that transition placement, as compared to special class placement, removed the EMR stigma, although half of the administrators agreed that the placement of transition pupils in regular classes increased the problems for regular class teachers. Less than half (45%) of the administrators agreed that transition pupils' academic performance was improved by placement in regular programs. Examination of the percent of responses "Uncertain" also suggested that there are a considerable number of outcomes which are unclear. Of particular interest was the split response to the possible effect of decreased ethnic representation in EMR classes, one of the major goals and motivations for development of transition efforts. Taken as a whole, however, the findings in Table 8 provide positive support for effects of transition programming and suggest that from administrators' perceptions, at least, the programs have been beneficial for both regular class and EMR classified pupils. In light of this positive response, it is interesting that the program continuation is still tied directly to State funding, in that 80% of the distruct administrators responded that they did not plan to continue their current transition programs when State funds were no long available.

Further insight into administrators' views of effects of transition programs may be found in Table 9. In the interviews conducted in the first part of this project, administrators were asked for their opinions as to various aspects of the transition programs. A number of representative statements from the interviewed administrators were included in the questionnaires sent to the full sample of districts conducting transition programs. Responses to these statements are summarized in Table 9. Opinions of the large group of administrators were consistent in that the social advantages of the transition program outweighed academic gain.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 9

District Administrators' Responses to Field Generated Statements about Transition Programs
N=156

Statement	Total N Responding	Agree		Disagree		Uncertain	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
The State should return to the 1970 criterion of one standard deviation below the mean for possible EMR placement.	151	56	36	64	41	31	20
Many high school transition pupils lost work-study program options as a result of their status change.	141	45	29	40	26	56	36
Transition students are "not making it" socially and behaviorally in regular classrooms.	154	33	21	88	56	33	21
Many pupils now in transition programs would be better off in specialized programs for EMRs.	152	54	35	66	42	32	21
Transition programs should be permanently implemented.	154	108	69	26	17	20	13
Transition students initially had positive attitudes in their transition placement, but after a short time developed negative attitudes toward school, teachers, and self.	154	25	16	92	60	37	24
Transition programs do not give sufficient service to children.	154	61	40	73	47	20	13
Academic pressure in the regular classroom quickly caused increased academic failure, feelings of insecurity, and frustration for transition pupils.	152	58	38	64	41	30	19
Transition students are "not making it" academically in regular classrooms.	154	66	43	60	39	28	18
Many parents want their decertified child to remain in EMR classrooms.	154	19	12	84	55	51	33
Transition programs require more adequate funding on a State level	155	94	61	32	21	29	19

The consistently high percent of "Uncertain" responses suggests that many program effects are unknown, even at the local district level.

Administrators' Recommendations and Comments

Finally, administrators were given opportunity and space to add comments about transition programs and to make recommendations for program improvement. This section generated a wide diversity of response. Of the 156 respondents, 44 chose to make subjective comments. Review of subjective responses revealed them to be positive, negative, or neutral/mixed. Lack of consensus was clear, as eight comments were positive, 13 negative, and 23 mixed or neutral. Typical examples of positive responses included:

> "Our transition program has been successful and will be continued at district expense."
>
> "It is our opinion in _____ (district) that we have seen more dramatic changes in students placed in the program (transition) than in any other special education placement."
>
> "This program has been very beneficial -- we highly recomment it."
>
> "Parents who have had a child return to _____ have been very enthusiastic about the benefit to their children."

Examples of negative responses were:

> "If we had to do it over again we would skip the transition program. We had a few unhappy experiences with parents. For the most part I would say most students profited by the experiment."
>
> "State funding needs to be increased for these spcial problem pupils. They cost more to do even an average job."
>
> "Every effort has been made to minimize the stigma (Mentally Retarded) and provide appropriate educational opportunities but the emphasis on the stigma has reached the ridiculous state of denial that there is a handicap. Denial of the existence of mental retardation is an escape from reality and we have better means of dealing with delusions."

"While we are in agreement with the philosophy of mainstreaming pupils in regular classrooms wherever possible, we do not feel the transition program was an adequate implementation of that philosophy. Hopefully, Master Plan Programming will more nearly meet the educational requirements of transitional and other pupils with exceptional needs.

Mixed or neutral responses included the following:

"The length of time that the transition program has been in effect has not allowed valid statistical data to be gathered and the end product is really an unknown factor because of this."

"We need to be able to set up a two period schedule for these students, enough to get in more concentrated reading and math. There is no provision in 7th or 8th grade for job training or career development."

"The three year period was not long enough for most children. Most of these children will have to be put back or into other programs. For what it cost the state to operate this program they were getting off cheap."

Summary and Recommendations

This review of transition programs in California public schools was based on information supplied by administrators responsible for program operation in their districts. Administrators in ten selected school districts provided detailed descriptions of their programs, and administrators in 156 districts supplied information through a mailed questionnaire. The sample included high Anglo, high Black, and high Spanish surname districts, as well as districts ranging from very small to super size. Districts represent the State geographically, and include both rural and urban schools. For the most part, data from the interview and questionnaires were consistent, although some differences were noted. Interview respondents tended to be more detailed in discussion of program problems and

to be somewhat less optimistic as to program effects than were questionnaire respondents. It is possible that findings reflect actual differences in programs and districts, or more likely, that they are related to the data collection techniques. Major findings are summarized.

All districts in the sample implemented systematic procedures to review pupils in EMR status in order to determine eligibility for transition placement. Depth, scope, and specifics of procedures varied widely, however, ranging from relatively cursory review of old test scores, to indepth individual re-evaluation of all pupils in EMR classification. In the majority of districts psychometric scores, either old or new, were the primary influence on decision as to transition classification.

Ethnic characteristics of pupils reclassified and placed in transition programs reflected the ethnic characteristics of the district; high Anglo districts reclassified Anglo pupils, Black districts reclassified Black pupils. However, many districts with high proportions of ethnic minorities apparently made especially vigorous efforts to utilize transition programming, as according to administrators estimates of ethnic minority pupils reclassified in those districts exceeded the proportion of ethnic minorities in the school population. On the contrary, numbers of Anglo pupils placed in transition status was less than expected according to district population parameters.

A variety of transition programs options were used, some districts reclassifying all eligible pupils from EMR to EH or some other special education categories, other placing pupils in full day, self-contained transition classes, or integrating former special class pupils totally into regular classes. The single most popular transition model was regular class placement with paraprofessional aides. Almost all transition

options were based on some kind of tutorial arrangement to provide individualized help in subject matter areas.

Inservice training for staff serving transition pupils was conducted by approximately half the sample districts. Direct instructional personnel e.g., teachers, aides, and tutors, were the major target groups for such specialized training. Few districts provided staff development for principals, school psychologists, guidance people, or others working with transition pupils and those who teach them. For the most part effectiveness of inservice programming was unknown, administrators expressing need for help in development of comprehensive inservice planning and programming.

The majority of transition programs were conducted within the limits of State funding, some districts matching with local financial resources. Administrators reported State Department of Education guidelines and information of help in terms of organizational options, funding arrangements, and the like, but of limited help in substantive aspects of educational programming, e.g., curriculum, staff development, evaluation. Districts frequently appeared to have insufficient professional guidance from special educators within their districts, and/or from the State Department of Education. A kind of paradox was apparent, in that administrators voiced the need for more help from the State, at the same time objecting to the rigidity of legislative and State determined regulations for classification and placement.

Administrators reported generally positive but mixed perceptions of outcomes or effects of transition programs on pupils and school personnel. There was agreement that the review and reclassification process had corrected many previous inequities of placement, but there was less confidence

that transition programming per se had been consistently beneficial to transition or regular class pupils. Placement in regular programs was viewed as having positive effects on transition pupils' social adjustment, self-concepts, and the like. There was less strong support for the beneficial effects of placement on pupils' educational achievement. Overall, there was a high degree of uncertainty about program effects, due in large part to inadequate systems for evaluation. In the few districts carrying out comprehensive evaluation plans, findings were clearly positive. For the districts as a whole, however, it is not possible to determine with confidence the kinds and extent of program effects. Subjectively, perceptions of the administrators were positive. Yet, few districts plan to continue transition programs after State funding ends.

An indirect outcome of transition programs had to do with changed characteristics of continuing EMR programs. In administrators' views, ethnic representation of EMR classes had not changed markedly from pre-transition days, but there were in total fewer EMR classes, and the level of educational programs in those classes was somewhat lower.

For the most part findings were consistent across district parameters of size and ethnic representation. Although the sociopolitical thrust leading to reclassification and transition legislation was primarily motivated by injustices to ethnic minority and economically disadvantaged pupils, implementation of legal mandates affected the educational treatment for all pupils in special education classes for the educable mentally retarded. Pupils of all ethnic groups and from wide ranges of socioeconomic backgrounds were reviewed, many reclassified. Re-evaluation procedures demonstrated clearly that a number of pupils had been improperly labeled mentally retarded. This pejorative label has been removed

from these pupils, such a step in itself an indication of program success.

Outcomes at the next step, i.e. educational programming, are cloudy, however. Data on which to evaluate program effects on transition and regular pupils are not available. Comprehensive descriptions of operational aspects of programs are limited. In a sense, we are left to assess unknown programs in terms of unknown outcomes. The point becomes critical given the strong national support for "mainstreaming" exceptional children into regular school programs, and in light of the Master Plan for Special Education within the State of California. The transition program in California, although no longer formally operational, may well serve to provide direction and guidelines for implementation of the Master Plan.

On the basis of findings in this report, it is clear that extensive work is needed in at least three major areas:

1) Preparation of regular school personnel to deal effectively with children with particular exceptionalities. Preparation must include both preservice and inservice training, and must involve the range of school professionals and paraprofessionals, not just direct teaching personnel.

2) Investigation of options within the regular program to ensure appropriateness of educational techniques and content for particular children or groups of children. Implications may involve legislative as well as operational program changes, as mandated criteria for classification sometimes impede program accommodations.

3. Development of comprehensive, feasible, and usable systems for evaluation of program outcomes.

In an address on mainstreaming pupils into regular education programs, presented at the American Association on Mental Deficiency meeting in 1974, Jane Mercer suggested that the WHY of mainstreaming is to be understood in the perspective of history, that the WHO of mainstreaming is in large part a decision of the courts, but that the HOW of mainstreaming "...is the current challenge of public education (Mercer, 1974)." California transition efforts may well be considered in light of Professor Mercer's analysis. It is clearly the third question which has been tried out in the various kinds of transition programs reviewed in this report. There are at least two subquestions which must be answered: How can we serve pupils with a broad range of abilities, talents, skills, and experiences in the regular school program? How do we know what we have accomplished?

References

Britton, A.L. An evaluation of transition programs in selected California school districts. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1972.

California State Department of Education, Ethnic Survey of EMR classes, Prepared by Fred Hanson, Consultant, Mentally Retarded Programs, April, 1974.

Chandler, J. & Plakos, J. Spanish-speaking pupils classified as educable mentally retarded. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1969.

Cohen, J.S. & De Young, H. The role of litigation in the improvement of programming for the handicapped. The first review of special education. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: Journal of Special Education Press, 1973, 261-286.

Coleman, J.S. The concept of equality of educational opportunity. Harvard Educational Review, 1968, 38 (1), 7-22.

Covarrubias, V. San Diego Unified School District, Civil Action No. 70-30d (S.D. Cal. 1971).

Diana V. Board of Education, Civil Action No. C-70-37 (N.D. Cal. 1970).

Flynn, T.M. Regular class adjustment of EMR students attending a part-time special education program. Journal of Special Education, 1974, 8 (2), 167-173.

Gampel, D.H., Gottleib, J., & Harrison, R.H. Comparison of classroom behavior of special-class EMR, integrated EMR, low I.Q., and non-retarded children. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1974, 79 (1), 16-21.

Gampel, D.H., Harrison, R.H. & Budoff, M. An observational study of segregated and integrated EMR children and their nonretarded peers: Can we tell the difference by looking?, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Research Institute of Educational Problems, 1972.

Gonzales, E. & Brinegar, L. Transition programs authorized by Education Code Section 18102.11. Communication to County and District Superintendents of Schools. Sacramento: Division of Special Education and Division of Instruction, April, 1971.

Guadalupe V. Tempe Elementary School District, Civil Action No. 71-435 (D. Ariz. 1971).

Guerin, G.R. & Szatlocky, K. Integration programs for the mildly retarded. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the California Association of School Psychologists. San Diego, March, 1974. Exceptional Children, in press.

Hansen, P.A. Educationally handicapped programs in selected school districts of Southern California. Doctoral Dissertation, U.C.L.A., 1970. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University MicroFilms No. 71-10 639, 1971.

Jones, R.L. Labels and stigma in special education. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38 (7), 553-564.

Keogh, B.K., Becker, L.D., Kukic, M.B. & Kukic, S.J. Programs for educationally handicapped and educable mentally retarded pupils: Review and recommendations Technical Report SERP 1972-A11, University of California, Los Angeles, 1972.

Kirp, D.L. Schools as sorters: The constitutional and policy implications of student classification. University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 1973, 121 (4).

Kirp, D.L. Buss, W. & Kuriloff, P. Legal reform of special education: Empirical studies and procedural proposals. California Law Review, 1974, 62 (1), 40-155.

Lambert, N.M., Gleason, W.P. & Wilcox, M.R. Assessment manual for the diagnosis of educable mentally retarded pupils. Berkeley: University of California, 1972.

Los Angeles Unified School District, Research and Evaluation Branch. Evaluation of the EMR transition program. Report No. 340, June, 1974.

Mercer, J.R. Sociological perspectives on mild retardation. In H.C. Haywood (Ed.), Social-cultural aspects of mental retardation. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Mercer, J.R. The who, why, and how of mainstreaming. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association on Mental Deficiency. Toronto, June, 1974.

Placement of underachieving minority group children in special classes for the educable mentally retarded. A report to the California State legislature as Required by House Resolution 444. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1970.

Ross, S., De Young, H. & Cohen, J.S. Confrontation: Special education and the law. Exceptional Children, 1971, 4 (7), 5-12.

Stewart V. Phillips, Civil Action No. 70-1199F (D. Mass. 1970).

Texas Education Agency, Department of Special Education and Special Schools. Impact of Intramural Research Program: Project Prime in Texas. A Report to the Commission of Education, USOE, September, 1974.

Weintraub, F.J. Recent influences & law regarding the identification and educational placement of children. Focus on Exceptional Children. 1972, 4 (2).

Workshop on Minority Group Children in Special Education. Summary and Recommendations. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, June 20-21, 1968.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A

House Resolution No. 444, as Amended by Assemblyman Wadie P. Deddeh

WHEREAS, The Members of the Assembly have learned of mounting criticism from representatives of certain minority groups, most particularly culturally bilingual groups, to the effect that a disproportionate number of children from such groups are assigned to classes for the mentally retarded; and

WHEREAS, The California Association of School Psychologists and Psychometrists, in a memorandum dated June,1969, has taken note of the problems in this area; and

WHEREAS, The association believes that school districts should undertake careful reevaluation of all students in classes for the Educable Mentally Retarded starting in September, 1969; and

WHEREAS, The association further recommends that parents of such assigned students be involved in the placement of their children; and

WHEREAS, The association, together with organizations of Mexican-American parents, has formulated a plan for correcting such problems, to be presented to the State Board of Education for its consideration; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Members (1) welcome the cooperation between the California Association of School Psychologists and Psychometrists and the aforementioned Mexican-American organizations, (2) strongly urge the State Board of Education to give attention and aid to proposals for changes in the structure of special education categories, and (3) request suggestions from the State Board of Education for legislation on the subject of this resolution during the 1970 Regular Session of the Legislature, if any legislation is considered necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the State Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the President of the California Association of School Psychologists and Psychometrists, and to the presiding officers of the Association of Mexican-American Educators, the League of United Latin American Clubs, the Mexican-American Youth Association, the Mexican-American Political Association, the United Mexican-American Students, the American G.I. Forum, and the California Rural Legal Defense Association.

Resolution, as amended, ordered to the Consent Calendar.

WILSON RILES
Superintendent of Public Instruction
and Director of Education

Appendix B

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATE EDUCATION BUILDING, 721 CAPITOL MALL, SACRAMENTO 95814

April 13, 1971

TO: County and District Superintendents of Schools

FROM: Division of Special Education and Division of Instruction (445-4036)

SUBJECT: Transition Programs Authorized by Education Code Section 18102.11

During the past two years district and county offices have reported the removal from special education classes of over 10,000 pupils formerly classified as EMR (Educable Mentally Retarded). Significant numbers of these pupils still require special help in order to benefit from their school experiences. Education Code Section 18102.11 authorizes supplementary instructional services to those pupils who have been removed from EMR programs during the 1969-70 and 1970-71 school year.

Pupils reassigned to regular class programs from classes for the mentally retarded may now be assigned to a "transition program" to provide supplementary instructional services to facilitate their adjustment in regular classes.

Suggested Procedures for Operating a Transition Program

Each pupil should be individually assessed so that a program may be established to meet his unique needs in transferring to the regular program. This assessment may be done as part of the case work-up when dismissing the pupil from the EMR program and should include the following:

1. Pertinent observations by the EMR teacher and other school personnel.

2. Test instruments and other diagnostic devices should be utilized that will reflect the strengths, potential problem areas or disabilities which will aid in developing a program suited to pupil needs.

64

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An assessment or survey should be made of the regular class program to determine those curriculum related skills and abilities which are necessary for success within that program. These items should then be listed in priority and matched against the student's assessment profile. Instructional objectives should be written for those curriculum related skills and abilities that the student does not have but are necessary for success in the regular program. Personnel designated from regular instruction should assume the major responsibility for this planning task.

An assessment or survey should be made of the regular program to determine skills and abilities which are necessary for pupils to successfully function in school and to successfully deliver such curriculum related skills and abilities. These items should then be listed in priority and matched against the individual pupil's assessment profile. Behavioral objectives should be written for those skills and abilities that are found to be lacking. Personnel from regular instruction, special education, and pupil personnel services should be responsible for this task.

Acquire any needed personnel (teachers, aides), materials, or facilities necessary to meet the instructional needs as determined in procedures II and III. This should be a joint effort between special education and regular instruction.

Plan procedures for periodic evaluation of program objectives and pupil progress. Personnel from regular instruction, special education, and pupil personnel services should be responsible for this task.

Implement transition program. The director of special education should be responsible for the administration and supervision of the transition program.

The transition program should terminate for an individual pupil when the program objectives have been reached. Personnel from regular instruction, special education, and pupil personnel services should be responsible for this task.

Students who will graduate from the transition group before they have reached the regular program are exempt from the minimum grade requirements pursuant to the California Administrative Code 1600, 10,000 and Education Code Section 8573.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Fundable Proto-Types of Transition Programs

Innovative and exemplary designs are encouraged and the following prototypes are suggested:

A. Resource Learning Center - Individual instruction and/or small group instruction for short periods of time (generally from 30 minutes to two hours).

B. Consulting Teacher - Assists the regular class teacher in modifying the curriculum and obtaining appropriate instructional materials to meet the individual needs of the student in transition.

C. Ancillary Teacher Assistants - i.e. instructional aides, student assistance, etc., to provide special help to the transition pupil before, during, or after school.

D. In-service Training Programs - For all teachers who have transition pupils in their classes. Such programs might include instruction in writing behavioral objectives, behavior modification techniques, methods of recognizing unique learning styles, and adapting classroom instruction.

E. Pupil Personnel Consultants - Provide counseling for individual or groups of pupils as well as consultation for teachers and parents.

F. Bilingual Consultants - Teachers and/or aides for those with limited English-speaking ability.

Allowable Expenses

The allowable current expenses are for only identifiable direct costs for supplemental education for these children such as special supplies, special teaching aids, supplemental teacher and inservice training costs. There shall be no proration of regular teachers salaries, administrative costs, or any other current expense classifications that are a part of the regular educational program.

Personnel at the local level are urged to utilize every available avenue to jointly combine the resources of every segment of the educational system.

Eugene Gonzales, Chief
Division of Instruction

Leslie Brinegar, Chief
Division of Special Education

Appendix C

Phase I Interview Schedule

Transition Project

Name of Interviewer

Section A--Identifying and descriptive information

1. Name of school district _____

2. Title of person(s) interviewed and program responsibilities:_____

3. ADA Information
   Total ADA_____
   Special Ed. ADA_____
   EH ADA_____
   EMR ADA_____
   Transition ADA_____

4. Number of Special Classes
   EMR_____
   EH_____
   Transition_____

Section B--Decertification

1. Has your school district decertified EMR children?

2. Is it possible to discern the exact number of decertified children for particular academic years? If so, who can provide this information? (Indicate our willingness to provide R.A. assistance to re-create past EMR lists, etc.)

3. Who was responsible for the administration of the decertification policy in your district?

4. If it was your responsibility, how was the district informed about the decertification state mandate (SB 1317)?

   Who else in your district had to be notified? (open ended)
   psychologist_____
   principals_____
   teachers_____
   other(s)_____

   How were they notified?

5. How much time did you have between your notification to decertify and the first decertification?

6. How did the district arrive at the list of candidates for review for decertification in the first decertification review?

7. What propostion of the EMR population were reviewed?
   %_____

8. When was the first review conducted?
   1969-70_____
   1970-71_____
   1971-72_____
   1972-73_____
   1973-74_____

9. Have you reviewed since this time?
   If so, is there a standard periodic review?
   When? Monthly_____
   Quarterly_____
   Yearly_____
   No Standard Time_____

10. How do you <u>now</u> select EMR students for review?
    What happens on a yearly basis?
    Every three years?
    Does the district review all EMR students?
    Or are the candidates for review chosen on the basis of:
    teacher recommendations_____ parent request_____
    psychologist recommendations____ test scores--old scores_____
    principal recommendations_____ test scores--retest_____

11. Who or what group considers the candidates for decertification?
    A & D_____
    school psychologist_____
    school administrator_____
    What is the membership of the group? (titles)_____

12. Were the candidates for decertification re-tested or were past psychometri and achievement scores sufficient?

13. A. With respect to the group who's responsibility it was to decertify a child, what were the major influences on their decision to decertify? (open ended)

    B. Were the following <u>strong</u>, <u>minor</u> or <u>neutral</u> influences on a decision to decertify:
    Medical report (school, Dr./Nurse, or private physician?)_____
    Achievement tests_____ Principal recommendation_____
    I.Q. tests_____ Parent request_____
    Behavior assessment_____ Others_____
    Teacher recommendation_____

14. Were the following strong, minor or neutral influences on a decision <u>not</u> to decertify?
    Medical report (school, Dr./Nurse, or private physician?_____
    Achievement tests_____ Principal recommendation_____
    I.Q. tests_____ Parent request_____
    Behavior assessment_____ Others_____
    Teacher recommendation_____

15. Were the following strong, minor or neutral influences on a decision to certify a candidate something other than EMR?

Medical report (school, Dr./Nurse, or private physician)_____
Achievement tests_____ Principal recommendation_____
I.Q. tests_____ Parent request_____
Behavior assessment_____ Others_____
Teacher recommendation_____

16. What are the major differences between decert. and EMRs?

	strong	minor	none
positive academic skills			
positive language skills			
positive behavior skills			
positive attitudes and motivations towards school			
positive attitudes and motivations towards teacher			
positive attitudes and motivations towards self			
positive parental influence on child			
teacher acceptance			
more public pressure			
test differences			

17. What are the major differences between a regular class student and a decert.?

	strong	minor	none
positive academic skills			
positive language skills			
positive behavior skills			
positive attitudes and motivations towards school			
positive attitudes and motivations towards teacher			
positive attitudes and motivations towards self			
positive parental influence on child			
teacher acceptance			
test differences			

18. What are the major differences between EMR and regular students?

	strong	minor	none
positive academic skills			
positive language skills			
positive behavior skills			
positive attitudes and motivations towards school			
positive attitudes and motivations towards teacher			
positive attitudes and motivations towards self			
positive parental influence on child			
teacher acceptance			
test differences			

19. What are the general characteristics of those children who are decertified
Sex_____

	Low	Low-med.	Med.
SES	6,000	6 9,000	9,000+

Ethnicity_____
Age(elem. age, Jr. High age, or H.S. age)_____

19. A. Have you changed the admisiion criteria for placement in EMR classroo as a result of the decertification mandate?

Section C...Transition

20. Now that a child has been decertified and has left the EMR classroom, what are the options that the school district has for the child's placement? (open ended)

21. Did the State Department of Education assist the district in any way in planning for those children who were decertified?

22. Was the initial Senate Bill (SB 529), which established transition programs for decertified children, adequate to meet the district's needs in planning for the decertified children? (Guidelines and Funds)

If yes, who was responsible for developing the transition plans and negotiating for approval?

What were the financial gains or losses?

If no, did the district develop other programs to aid in the transition from EMR classrooms to regular classrooms?

If so, what were they?

23. After the initial senate bill establishing transition program formulas expired and new Senate Bill S.B. 1218 extended the transition period--did the district elect to participate?

If yes, who was responsible for developing the transition plans and negotiating for approval?

If no, did the district develop other programs to aid in transition from EMR classrooms to regular classrooms?

24. If your district developed transition programs--what were the percentage and number of children provided these programs, by year.

	trans.		regular		other	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1969-70						
1970-71						
1971-72						
1972-73						
1973-74						

25. Of those provided transition programs, what were their general characteristics?
Sex
SES
Ethnicity
Age (elem., Jr. High, High School)

26. Who was responsible for determining the types of trans. programs developed by the district?
district administrator
district curriculum or psychological staff
district wide committee
district special services
local principal
transition teacher
special ed. teacher
regular teacher

27. What were the types of programs approved by the district?
self-contained_____
individual tutoring_____
itinerant teacher_____
resource rooms_____
paraprofessional aids_____
other(s)_____

28. Were the trans. programs available district wide?

29. How were schools informed of the availability of trans. programs?

30. What were the qualifications for a school to be granted a trans. program?

31. If the EMR population in the district was reduced, what happened to or where did the surplus Special Education EMR teacher go?
return to regular class #_____
left district #_____
transition class #_____
remain in EMR class #_____
EH class #_____
other #_____

32. What percentage (and number) of trans. teachers were:
"old" EMR teachers_____
regular teachers_____
new teachers_____
paraprofessionals_____
others_____

33. Who selected the transition teachers?

34. How were the transition teachers selected (on what basis or criterion)?
knowledge of curriculum_____
ability to individualize_____
available personnel_____
past experience with Spec. Ed. children_____
tenured teachers_____
training with regular children_____
volunteered_____

35. On what basis were EMR teachers selected to remain as teachers in EMR programs?
knowledge of curriculum_____
ability to individualize_____
available personnel_____
past experience with Spec. Ed. children_____
tenured teachers_____
volunteered_____

36. Has the nature or composition of the EMR classroom changed as a result of decertification? (Also SES and Ethnicity)

37. Were any inservice training sessions conducted because of the development of transition programs?

Type of inservice, by whom

For: regular teacher_____
spec. ed. class teachers_____
transition teachers_____
principals_____
school psychologists_____
others_____

38. Were any inservice training sessions conducted for the EMR teachers because of the change in the nature of the EMR class?

Type of inservice, by whom

For: special ed. class teachers_____
transition teachers_____
principals_____
school psychologists_____
others_____

39. In general, do regular and special class teachers attend the same inservice programs? If not, please briefly describe how your system works.

Section D--Follow up

40. Has the state requested or suggested an evaluation of the success of those children who were decertified?

A. If yes, how were (are) the children's progress evaluated?
by whom?
when?
with what results?
Are any "objective" measures used to evaluate academic or social achievem

B. If no, has the district instituted any assessment plans?

C. If yes, what are they?
Who does it?
When is it done?
What are the results?

D. If no, are you planning to assess the efficacy of the programs and the result of decertification at a later date? (when?)

E. If there are no district wide assessments, does the local school have the responsibility to assess the success of its decertification or transition programs?
If yes, who does the assessment?
What criteria are used?
When are the assessments done?
What are the results?

*Interviewers: if there are no plans to evaluate transition programs, indicate that a later phase of this project might be of assistance in providing some help.

41. Were there any decertified children who were later re-certified EMR?
#_____

42. Why would a child be re-certified? (open ended)

	strong	minor	none
academic skills			
language skills			
behavior skills			
attitudes and motivation toward school			
attitudes and motivation toward teacher			
attitudes and motivation toward self			
parental influence to keep child in spec. class			
teacher (transition or regular) rejection			
peer rejection			
personality difficulties			
test differences			
medical evaluation			
psychological evaluation			

Were any decertified children later certified something other than EMR?

EH #_____ NH #_____
LDG #_____ ED #_____
MH #_____

Section E--General Questions

43. What changes would you suggest in the decertification laws?

44. What changes would you suggest in the transition laws?

45. When the state funding for transition program runs out--will the district continue to provide transition classes?

Appendix D

TRANSITION PROGRAM QUESTIONAIRE
SPECIAL EDUCATION RESEARCH PROGRAM
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

MAY, 1974

Name of district_____ Title of Respondent_____

Grades served (check appropriate level): K-6____ 7-12____ K-12____

Total District ADA _____; EH ADA _____; EMR ADA _____; Transition ADA _____

Total Special Education ADA _____

Number of current EMR classes ____; Number of current EH classes _____

Of the total number of pupils formerly placed in EMR programs within your district, approximately what percent have been decertified to date? _____%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PLEASE CHECK OR FILL IN APPROPRIATE RESPONSES

1. How did the district decide who would be considered for possible decertification?

   a. records of all pupils in EMR programs were reviewed_____
   b. records of all minority pupils in EMR programs were reviewed_____
   c. EMR teachers nominated pupils for review_____
   d. principals nominated pupils for review_____
   e. school psychologist nominated pupils for review_____
   f. parents nominated pupils for review_____
   g. pupils asked to be reviewed_____
   h. other--please specify_____

2. Approximately what percent of decertified pupils were identified on the basis of prior information--e.g. test scores, cum records, etc.

   a. fewer than 10%_____ c. 26 - 50%_____ e. over 75%_____
   b. 10 - 25%_____ d. 51 - 75%_____

3. Approximately what percent of decertified pupils were retested by the school psychologist or psychometrist before a placement decision was reached?

   a. fewer than 10%_____ c. 26 - 50%_____ e. over 75%_____
   b. 10 - 25%_____ d. 51 - 75%_____

4. Are there pupils who were placed in transition programs who since have been returned to EMR programs?

   a. none_____ few_____ many_____; b. approximate percent_____;
   c. at parent request_____; at teacher request_____; on A & D routine review_____

5. Approximately what percent of decertified pupils (formerly classified EMR) were placed in another special education category (other than transition)?

   a. EH_____% c. TMR_____% e. OH_____%
   b. LD_____% d. MH_____% f. other_____%

6. Of the decertified (formerly classified EMR) pupils placed in transition programs, approximately what percent were placed in grades:

   a. 1 - 3_____; b. 4 - 6_____; c. 7 - 9_____; d. 10 - 12_____

7. Of the decertified (formerly classified EMR) pupils placed in transition programs, approximately what percent were:

   a. Anglo_____; b. Black_____; c. Asian_____; d. Spanish Surname_____;
   e. American Indian_____; f. other_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

8. Were there pupils who met transition criteria and who were recommended by school personnel for transition placement but who remained in EMR classes at the request of the parent?

   a. none_____ few_____ many_____; b. approximate percent_____

9. Were there pupils who technically still met EMR criteria but who were decertified and placed in transition programs at the request of the parent?

   a. none_____ few_____ many_____; b. approximate percent_____

10. Parents of potential transition pupils were consulted about the possible change in placement of their children:

    a. prior to formal review _____
    b. prior to decision to place them _____
    c. following decision to place them _____
    d. at the time of change in placement_____
    e. not notified_____

11. After decertification, where were pupils placed?

    a. self-contained transition classes_____
    b. EH class_____
    c. regular class only_____
    d. regular class plus resource room_____
    e. regular class plus paraprofessional aides_____
    f. regular class plus special education consultant_____
    g. regular class plus school psychologist as consultant_____
    h. itinerant tutors_____
    i. LDG's_____
    j. other_____

12. Was the source of funding for transition programs:

    a. state only_____
    b. district only_____
    c. matching district-state_____

    Was the funding adequate? yes_____ no_____

13. Were costs in excess of state funds? yes_____ no_____

14. When State funding runs out do you plan to continue your transition program?

    yes_____ no_____

15. Did your district provide inservice training specifically for personnel involved in transition programs?

    yes_____ no_____ (if no, please skip questions 16, 17, 18 & 19, and go directly to question 20)

16. Did inservice consist mainly of:

	Approx. no. of such sessions
workshops ___	_____
individual conferences ___	_____
group conferences ___	_____
outside speakers ___	_____
other ___	_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

17. For the most part, inservice training was directed at:

		Approx. no. of such sessions
a.	regular class teachers receiving transition pupils	___ _____
b.	EMR class teachers	___ _____
c.	EH class teachers	___ _____
d.	school psychologists	___ _____
e.	LDG teachers	___ _____
f.	resource room teachers	___ _____
g.	building principals	___ _____
h.	school nurses	___ _____
i.	paraprofessionals	___ _____
j.	itinerant tutors	___ _____
k.	others _____	_____
	_____	

18. Inservice for transition programs was conducted primarily by:

within district persons_____; outside district persons_____

19. In your opinion, did the inservice training program prepare regular school personnel (receiving teachers, building principals, etc.) for returning decertified pupils to regular classrooms?

yes_____ no_____ uncertain_____

If yes, what kinds of programs were most successful?

a._____

b._____

c._____

Recommendations and comments:

a._____

b._____

c._____

20. Did the State Department of Education provide assistance in implementing the development of transition programs in any of the following ways?

		Yes	No	Needed more help
a.	provided guidelines for implementation of Education Code regarding decertified pupils	___	___	___
b.	provided guidelines for implementation of Education Code regarding transition programs	___	___	___
c.	provided information regarding administrative program development	___	___	___
d.	provided information regarding curricular and instructional matters	___	___	___
e.	provided information regarding program evaluation	___	___	___
f.	provided help with teacher inservice training programs	___	___	___
g.	provided help in the preparation of forms for funding and/or program approval	___	___	___
h.	other _____	___	___	___

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

21. In your opinion, compared to traditional self-contained EMR classrooms, transitional placement has:

	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	No Chang
a. improved transition pupils' academic performance	___	___	___	___
b. improved transition pupils' social adjustment	___	___	___	___
c. improved transition pupils' classroom behavior	___	___	___	___
d. improved transition pupils' self concept	___	___	___	___
e. improved transition pupils' peer relationships	___	___	___	___
f. removed the EMR stigma	___	___	___	___
g. increased problems for regular class teachers	___	___	___	___
h. increased problems for regular class pupils	___	___	___	___
i. decreased ethnic representation in EMR classes	___	___	___	___
j. increased teachers' understanding and acceptance of problem children	___	___	___	___
k. lowered academic performance of transition pupils	___	___	___	___

22. Based on previous interviews with district administrators, the following recommendations or comments regarding transition programs were generated. Please indicate agreement or disagreement with each statement.

	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
a. The State should return to the 1970 criterion of one standard deviation below the mean for possible EMR placement.	___	___	___
b. Many high school transition pupils lost work-study program options as a result of their status change.	___	___	___
c. Transition students are "not making it" socially and behaviorally in regular classrooms.	___	___	___
d. Many pupils now in transition programs would be better off in specialized programs for EMRs.	___	___	___
e. Transition programs should be permanently implemented.	___	___	___
f. Transition students initially had positive attitudes in their transition placement, but after a short time developed negative attitudes toward school, teachers, and self.	___	___	___
g. Transition programs do not give sufficient service to children.	___	___	___
h. Academic pressure in the regular classroom quickly caused increased academic failure, feelings of insecurity, and frustration for transition pupils.	___	___	___
i. Transition students are "not making it" academically in regular classrooms.	___	___	___
j. Many parents want their decertified child to remain in EMR classrooms.	___	___	___
k. Transition programs require more adequate funding on a State level.	___	___	___

If there are areas regarding the decertification or transition programs that are not adequately covered in this questionaire, or if you have suggestions or recommendations, please feel free to comment below.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Please return to:

Special Education Research Program
Graduate School of Education
University of California
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024

Appendix E

Districts Participating in Phase I Interviews

Compton Unified

El Rancho Unified

Hayward Unified

Inglewood Unified

New Haven Unified

Oakland Unified

Pittsburg Unified

Redlands Unified

Santa Ana Unified

Walnut Valley Unified

Appendix F

Name of District

Amador Valley Joint Union High*

Hayward Unified*

Livermore Valley Joint Unified*

Newark Unified

Oakland City Unified*

San Leandro Unified

San Lorenzo Unified*

Butte County*

Chico Unified*

Grindley Union*

Paradise Unified*

Mt. Diablo Unified*

Pittsburg Unified*

El Dorado County Office of Education

El Dorado Union High*

Clovis Unified*

Kerman-Floyd Union Elementary

Kings Canyon Joint Unified

Parlier Unified

Sanger Unified*

Sierra Joint Union High*

Tranquility Union High

Glenn County*

Orland Public Schools

Eureka City High

Name of District

Brawley Elementary*

Brawley Union High

Bakersfield City Elementary*

Delano Union Elementary

Lamont Elementary*

Maricopa Unified*

Taft City Elementary*

Corcoran Joint Unified*

Hanford Joint Union High*

Lemorre Union Elementary*

Lakeport Unified

Middletown Unified*

ABC Unified*

Alhambra City High*

Azusa Unified*

Baldwin Park Unified*

Bassett Unified*

Bellflower Unified*

Charter Oak Unified*

Claremont Unified*

Compton Unified*

Culver City Unified*

East Whittier City Elementary*

El Rancho Unified*

Glendale Unified

Glendora Unified

Hacienda La Puente Unified

Name of District
Las Virgenes Unified*
Los Angeles Unified*
Los Nietos Elementary*
Lynwood Unified*
Montebello Unified
Mountain View Elementary*
Paramount Unified*
Pomona Unified*
Rowland Unified*
San Gabriel Elementary*
Santa Monica Unified
South Whittier Elementary*
West Covina Unified*
Kentfield Elementary*
Larkspur Elementary*
Mill Valley Elementary
Novato Unified*
San Rafael City High and City Elementary
Tamalpais Union High*
Willitis Unified
Dos Palos Joint Union High*
Gustine Unified*
Livingston Union Elementary
Merced City Elementary
Newman-Crows Landing School District*
Lee Vining Union*[1]
Gonzales Union High*

Name of District

Monterey Peninsula Unified*

Salinas Union High

Napa Valley Unified*

St. Helena Unified*

Nevada County*

Centralla Elementary*

Fountain Valley Elementary*

Garden Grove Unified*

Huntington Beach Union High*

La Habra City Elementary*

Ocean View Elementary

Placentai Unified*

San Joaquin School District*[2]

Santa Ana Unified*

Tustin Unified

Westminster School District*

Ackerman Elementary*

Auburn Union Elementary*

Eureka Union Elementary*

Foresthill Union Elementary*

Loomis Union Elementary

Newcastle Elementary

Penryn Elementary

Placer Joint Union High*

Placer Hills Union Elementary*

Rocklin Elementary*

Roseville Joint Union High*

Name of District
Tahoe-Truckee Unified*
Western Placer Unified*
Banning Unified
Coachella Valley Unified
Mecca School District
Oasis Joint Unified School District
Palo Verde Unified*
Perris School District
Perris Union High
San Jacinto Unified
Thermal Union Elementary*[3]
Elk Grove Unified*
Folsom-Cordova Unified*
North Sacramento Elementary*
Rio Linda Union*
Sacramento City Unified*
San Juan Unified
Hollister School District*
Central Elementary
Chaffey Union High*
Chino Unified*
Cucamonga Elementary
Fontana Unified*
Ontario-Montclair Elementary*
Redlands Unified*
Rialto Unified
San Bernardino City Unified*

Name of District
Upland Elementary*
Cajon Valley Union Elementary*
Chula Vista City Elementary*
Escondido Union Elementary*
Escondido Union High*
Fallbrook Union Elementary
Grossmont Union High
Lakeside Union Elementary*
La Mesa-Spring Valley Elementary*
Lemon Grove Elementary
Rich-Mar Union Elementary*
San Diego Unified*
San Dieguito Union High*
Santee Elementary
Sweetwater Union High*
Vista Unified
San Francisco Unified*
Banta Elementary
Escalon Unified*
Delta Island Union Elementary*
Jefferson Elementary
Lincoln Unified*
Lodi Unified
Tracy Elementary and Tracy Joint Union High*
Atascadero Unified*
Paso Robles School District

Name of District

San Luis Coastal Unified*

Bayshore Elementary*

Cabrillo Unified*

Jefferson Elementary

Jefferson Union High

Palo Alto Unified School District*

San Mateo Union High*

Sequoia Union High

South San Francisco Unified

Santa Barbara County*

Hope Elementary*

Orcutt Union Elementary*

Santa Barbara School District*

Santa Maria Joint Union High*

Alum Rock Union Elementary

Cupertono Union Elementary

East Side Union High*

Evergreen Elementary*

Gilroy Unified

Mt. Pleasant School District*

Oak Grove Elementary*

San Jose Unified*

San Lorenzo School District*

Santa Clara Unified

Sunnyvale Elementary*

Shasta County

Anderson Union High*

Name of District

Siskiyou County*

Etna Union Elementary

Etna Union High

Vallejo City Unified*

Healdsburg Union High*

Petaluma School District*

Roseland Elementary*

Santa Rosa City Elementary*

Sonoma Valley Unified*

Modesto City Schools*

Patterson Joint Unified*

Yuba City Unified*

Cutler-Orosi Joint Unified*

Dinuba Elementary*

Earlimart Elementary

Exeter Union High*

Farmersville Elementary

Liberty Elementary

Lindsay Unified

Monson-Sultant Joint Union Elementary*

Outside Creek Elementary*

Porterville Elementary

Richgrove Elementary*

Sundale Union Elementary

Three Rivers Union School District

Tulare City Elementary*

Tulare Union High*

Name of District
Visalla Unified*
Woodlake Union Elementary*
Woodlake Union High
Sonora Union High
Hueneme Elementary*
Ojai Unified*
Oxnard Elementary*
Oxnard Union High*
Pleasant Valley Elementary*
Valley Oaks Union Elementary
Ventura Unified
Winters Joint Unified
Woodland Joint Unified*

---

1. Lee Vining Union School District became Eastern Sierra Unified School District.

2. San Joaquin School District became incorporated as part of two Unified school districts, Irvine & Saddleback.

3. Thermal Union Elementary School District became a part of the Coachella Valley Unified School District.

* Districts responding to questionnaire.

Appendix G

Phase I 1970-71

An Initial Attempt to Test the Relationship Between Man's Sensitive Period for Language Acquisition and His Ability to Learn Essential Reading Skills

W. Ragan Callaway

Analysis of Behaviors Eventuating in Referrals for Special Education

Steven R. Forness

Expectancy for Failure of Educationally Handicapped Children

Barbara K. Keogh

An Experimental Preschool Project: Pupil and Family Characteristics

Erma Bley

John B. Kershner

Differential Progress Rates Within the Educationally Handicapped Population

Janet Switzer

Characteristics of Programs and Pupils Designated Multihandicapped

Annette Tessier

Phase II 1971-1972

Classroom Observation of Potential Special Education Children

Steven R. Forness

Demonstration and Evaluation of an In-Service Program for Regular Classroom Teachers Designed to Increase Understanding and Acceptance of Exceptional Children

Michael Soloway

Frank M. Hewett

Programs for EH and EMR Pupils: Review and Recommendations

Barbara K. Keogh

Laurence D. Becker

Maurine B. Kukic

Stevan J. Kukic

Field Independence-Dependence, Reflection-Impulsivity, and Problem-Solving Styles of Preschool Children

Barbara K. Keogh

Melinda F. Welles

Andrea L. Weiss

Teachers' Perceptions of Educationally High Risk Children

Barbara K. Keogh

Cheryl Anne Tchir

Correlates of Early Reading Success in Preschool Children

Paul Klinger

W. Ragan Callaway

Audiological Assessment of MH Rubella Children

Shirley Oakes

Down's Syndrome Longitudinal Study

Jack Share

Gary Landman

Differential Progress Rates Within an Educationally Handicapped Population

Janet Switzer

Jill De Picciotto

Wilma Pearl

Development of Assessment Procedures for Young Multihandicapped Children

Annette Tessier

Rose Marie Swallow

Marie Poulsen

Glenda Gay

Instructional Models for Teaching Disadvantaged Educable Mentally Retarded

Alice V. Watkins

Phase III 1972-73

Assessing the Characteristics of Educable Mentally Retarded and Educationally Handicapped Students Related to Successful Integration into a Regular Classroom

Douglas J. Palmer
Frank M. Hewett

Measurement of Childrens' Perceptual Styles: A Methodological Study

Barbara K. Keogh
Karen Tardo

Screening Kindergarten Children for Early Intervention Through Direct Observation of Classroom Behavior

Steven R. Forness

School Psychologists' Services for Special Education Children in California: Review and Recommendations

Barbara K. Keogh
Laurence D. Becker
Robert J. McLoughlin
Stevan J. Kukic
Maurine B. Kukic

Teachers' Perceptions of Educationally High-Risk Pupils from Los Socio-Economic Backgrounds

Barbara K. Keogh
Adele S. Windeguth

UCLA Graduate Research on the Gifted and Their Education

May V. Seagoe
Barbara Nash Mills

Development of Teacher Assessment Procedures for Young Multihandicapped Children: Interim Report

Annette Tessier
Rose-Marie Swallow
Marie Kanne Poulsen

A Field Study of Auditory-Linguistic Factors in the Comprehension of Aurally Taped Materials for Handicapped Children

Rose-Marie Swallow
Marie Kanne Poulsen

Functional Analysis of WISC Performance of Children Classified Educationally Handicapped and Educable Mentally Retarded

Barbara K. Keogh
Robert J. Hall

Assessment and Educational Planning for MH and Sensory-Impaired Children

Janice Laine

A Language Behavior Rating Scale for Young Multihandicapped Children

Glenda I. Gay

Modifiability of Conceptual Tempo in Educatonally "High Risk" Children

Laurence D. Becker

Delivery of Special Education Services to Children in Rural Areas of California

Barbara K. Keogh
Martha A. Lyon
Laurence D. Becker
Maurine B. Kukic
Stevan J. Kukic

Phase IV 1973-74

Services to Exceptional Children in Rural Areas of California

Barbara K. Keogh
Martha A. Lyon
and collaborating authors

A Review of Transition Programs in California Public Schools

Barbara K. Keogh
Marc L. Levitt
Kenyon S. Chan
George Robson

Historical and Legislative Antecedents of Decertification and Transitional Programs in California Public Schools

Barbara K. Keogh
Marc L. Levitt
George Robson

Inservice Training for Personnel Serving Exceptional Children

Ann M. McGinty
Barbara K. Keogh

Early Identification of High Risk and High Potential Kindergarten Children

Barbara K. Keogh
Melinda W. Sbordone

Early Identification of Exceptional Children for Educational Planning

Barbara K. Keogh
Robert J. Hall
Laurence D. Becker

Social and Psychological Factors Related to Academic Performance

Kenyon S. Chan

Development and Evaluation of a Special Education Inservice Training Program for Regular Classroom Teachers

Michael M. Soloway

Construction of a Language Assessment Measure for Hearing Impaired Children

Janice Laine

Survey of Selected Infant and Preschool Special Education Programs in California

Annette Tessier
M. Patricia Simmons